

**MARXISM AND
INTERNATIONALISM**
PALME DUTT

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW



PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

MAY 1968

NO. 1 / 35 CENTS

"Let us recall the main principle of the International: solidarity. We shall achieve the great goal for which we are striving provided we firmly consolidate this life-giving principle among all workers in all countries."

KARL MARX

(From speech on the Hague Congress of the
International at a mass meeting in
Amsterdam, September 8, 1872)



1818 - 1968

WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!

**World Marxist
Review**
*problems of peace
and socialism*

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

MAY, 1968
VOLUME 11
NUMBER 5

Authorized as Second
Class Mail, Post Office
Department, Ottawa and
for payment of postage
in cash. Printed in
Canada.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW
is the North American
edition of the monthly
journal Problems of Peace
and Socialism published
in Prague. The North
American edition is
published by Progress
Books, 487 Adelaide St.
West, Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada.

Copyright 1968 by
Progress Books, Canada.
All Rights Reserved.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
\$3.50 a year. Single
copies 35 cents. Bundle
of five or more, 25 cents
per copy. Outside
Canada, add 15 cents
exchange.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE
AND SOCIALISM is also
published in French,
Russian, Bulgarian,
Czech, Dutch, German,
Greek, Hungarian,
Italian, Japanese,
Mongolian, Polish,
Rumanian, Spanish,
Swedish and Vietnamese.
Subscriptions to these
may be obtained through
Progress Books,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto, at \$3.50 a year.

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
487 Adelaide St. W.,
Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada.



WMR

CONTENTS

3 150th anniversary of birth of Karl Marx

P. DUTT	MARXISM AND INTERNATIONALISM
L. LEONTYEV	MARXISM AND SOCIALIST COMMODITY-MONEY RELATIONS
O. REINHOLD	THE MARXIST THEORY OF CRISES— ITS RELEVANCE TODAY
Y. FYODOROV	MAN AND NATURE

**32 Current problems of world Communist
movement**

GUS HALL	FOR WORLD COMMUNIST UNITY
----------	---------------------------

39 The struggle against imperialism

IB NORLUND	UNITY—THE ANSWER TO THE AGGRESSOR
J. PRAZSKY	VIETNAM: THE STRENGTH OF THE PEOPLE
Z. BRONIAREK	A DEEP-GOING CRISIS
E. PAPAIOANNOU	NEW PHASE IN THE STRUGGLE OF CYPRIOT PEOPLE
A. BECERRA	U.S. IMPERIALISM IN LATIN AMERICA
F. MIERES	THE DELHI CONFERENCE AND THE THIRD WORLD

62 In the Communist and Workers' Parties

F. BILLOUX	FRANCE: TOWARDS UNITY OF THE LEFT
R. LARSEN	12th CONGRESS OF THE CP OF NORWAY
M. SEN	EIGHTH CONGRESS OF THE CP OF INDIA
L.A.	ACTION PROGRAM OF CP OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

91 Against the persecution of democrats

H. BARRERA	CONSTITUTIONAL DICTATORSHIP AND VIOLENCE
H.S.	ISRAEL: REACTION ON THE RAMPAGE
KHALED	AGAINST REPRESSIONS IN TUNISIA

Back Issues Wanted of "WORLD MARXIST REVIEW"

We are short of these WORLD MARXIST REVIEW issues: Sept.-Dec. 1958; Jan.-Dec. 1959; Jan.-Dec. 1960; Jan.-Dec. 1961; Jan.-Dec. 1962; Jan.-April 1963; June 1963; Aug.-Oct. 1963; Jan. 1964; Mar.-June 1964; Aug. 1964; Nov. 1964; Jan.-April 1965; July-Sept. 1965; Nov. 1965; Jan. 1966; April-June 1966; Oct-Dec. 1966.

We will exchange copies for those sent us. Please ship copies COLLECT to Progress Books, 487 Adelaide St. W., Toronto 2B, Canada.

WMR

among our contributors

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| GUS HALL | General Secretary, Communist Party USA |
| EZEKIAS PAPAIOANNOU | General Secretary, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL) |
| FRANCOIS BILLOUX | Member, Political Bureau, Central Committee, Communist Party of France |
| R. PALME DUTT | Editor, Labour Monthly |
| IB NORLUND | Member, Executive Committee and Secretariat, Central Committee, Communist Party of Denmark |
| MOHIT SEN | Member, National Council, Communist Party of India |
| OTTO REINHOLD | Member, Central Committee, Socialist Unity Party of Germany |
| FRANCISCO MIERES | Member, Central Committee, Communist Party of Venezuela |
| LEV LEONTYEV | Corresponding Member, USSR Academy of Sciences |
| EVGENY FYODOROV | Member, USSR Academy of Sciences |
| ZIGMUNT BRONIAREK | Polish publicist |
| LONGINO BECERRA | Honduras publicist |

Marxism and internationalism

R. PALME DUTT

The decision of the representatives of 66 Communist and Workers' Parties at Budapest to convene an International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties by the end of this year is a very positive step towards the aim, now more indispensable than ever in the present dangerous international situation, to promote the unity and united action of the world communist movement.

Internationalism has always been from the outset, and has remained and remains through all the varying stages and phases of development, inseparable from communism.

Marx and Engels in the foundation document of communism, the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, published one hundred and twenty years ago, set themselves to answer the question: Wherein do the Communists differ from other working class parties? They answered this question with a precise and classic definition:

"The Communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only:

(1) In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality;

(2) In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole."

Thus the first distinguishing feature of communism on which Marx and Engels lay stress is its international character. Indeed, the two distinguishing features described may be regarded as in fact one ('this only'): that the Communists represent the basic long-term interests of the whole working class, as against either

sectionalism or national division.

Further, this definition sets out the distinctive character of proletarian internationalism, which finds its conscious political expression in Communism. The conception here expressed is not confined to the aim of particular actions of mutual aid or temporary alliances of separate movements for specific objectives. Communism expresses and "brings to the front," that is, places in the forefront "the common interests of the entire proletariat irrespective of nationality." The working class movement in each particular country necessarily operates within the political framework and conditions of that country, "must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself *the nation*," and therefore "it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word." But every such struggle of the working class within a particular country, and within the framework of the political conditions of that country, is in fact a constituent part of the international struggle of the working class against capitalism. The strength of Communism is precisely that it sees every such struggle from an international standpoint, and judges the tasks and responsibilities within a given country in the light of its basic understanding of the given stage of the international situation and the requirements of the international struggle in that stage.

When Marx and Engels at the end of the same *Communist Manifesto* pointed to Germany as the prospective scene of the first victory of the proletarian revolution "immediately following" the imminent democratic revolution, they wrote this, not as Germans (though their links with the German working class movement were of the closest from the beginning to the end of

their active political lives) but as internationalists, surveying the whole international scene and the prospects of revolution. When the outcome of 1848 proved the error of this prediction ("History has proved us, and all who thought like us, wrong," as Engels wrote frankly in his 1895 Preface to Marx's *Class Struggles in France*), Marx and Engels did not cling to any theories of an inevitable vanguard role of Germany, but continued to survey the whole scene from their internationalist standpoint, and therefore in their later years were able to see and to proclaim that Russia had become "the vanguard of revolutionary action in Europe" (Marx and Engels, 1882 Preface to the Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto*).

When Engels dedicated his *Condition of the Working Class in England* in its original edition of 1845 "To the Working Classes of Great Britain," he singled out for his highest praise and tribute the internationalism of the English workers of the age of Chartism:

"A foreigner to THEM (the upper classes) not to YOU, I hope. No working man in England—nor in France either, by-the-by—ever treats me as a foreigner. With the greatest of pleasure I observed you to be free from that blasting curse, national prejudice and national pride, which after all means nothing but WHOLESALE SELFISHNESS—I observed you to sympathize with everyone who applies his powers to human progress—may he be an Englishman or not—to admire everything great and good, whether nursed on your native soil or not—I found you to be more than mere ENGLISHMEN, members of a single isolated nation, I found you to be MEN, members of the great and universal family of mankind, who know their interest and that of all the human race to be the same."

There breathes the fervent spirit of internationalism, which three years later found its fully scientific expression in the *Communist Manifesto*.

When Lenin in 1902 carried forward the perspective of Marx and Engels in defining the future vanguard world role of the Russian working class revolution, and wrote

"History has now confronted us with an immediate task which is more revolutionary than all the immediate tasks which confront the proletariat of any other country. The fulfilment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark, not only of European, but also, it may be said,

of Asiatic reaction, places the Russian proletariat in the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat" (Lenin, *What Is To Be Done?* 1902). Lenin wrote this, not because as a Russian he was allowing his judgment to be colored by Russian national pride or was seeking to claim some innate Russian national superiority, but because as an internationalist, with full understanding of the international implications of the impending Russian revolution, he was giving a completely objective international judgment of the future vanguard role of the victorious Russian working class as the pioneer of socialism and national liberation breaking the chains of imperialism. The half century since 1917 has abundantly proved the truth of this judgment. What the enemies of Communism, with characteristic philistine blindness and crude appeals to national prejudice, have continued from the outset and still continue to try to smear as the supposed "pro-Russian" outlook of Communists, is precisely the truly internationalist outlook which understands the significance of the role of the vanguard of the socialist revolution, equally in the first victory of the working class, the building of socialism, the defeat of the fascist enemies of socialism, and now the beginning of the advance of communism.

Marx, Engels and Lenin, throughout their political lives, were the living embodiment of internationalism, alike in theory and in practice.

Their every utterance, and every political judgment of a particular concrete problem and situation, was imbued with the spirit of internationalism. They were at home, with close and intimate knowledge, in the conditions and problems of the working class movement in each of the leading countries. They were in continuous contact with the active personalities, equally in direct consultations and meetings, and in voluminous correspondence. Marx was the inspiring spirit of the First International, and in the midst of all the exacting demands of his creative work in the production of *Capital*, gave of his time without stint to serve on its General Council, participate in its weekly meetings, attend to all its multifarious business and draft its principal documents. Lenin, in the midst of all the responsibilities of the leadership of the Russian Communist Party and the socialist revolution, and the government of the first socialist state, was the inspiring spirit of the Third Communist Interna-

tional, served on its Executive Committee, guided its first three Congresses, drafted its most important documents, and gave his final guidance at the Fourth Congress.

The early Socialist and Social Democratic Parties in the European countries in the nineteenth century grew up under the fostering care and guidance of Marx and Engels. Their leaders journeyed to London to seek their advice, and after the death of Marx in 1883 Engels continued to fulfil this role until his death in 1895. They never hesitated to express their viewpoint and, if necessary, criticisms, on the problems arising in the evolution of the movement within each country. Was this "interference" in the "internal affairs" of sovereign democratically run parties? Was this an attempt to establish a "single directing center" overriding the national autonomy of each party within its own area? On the contrary. Except for the period of service of Marx on the General Council of the First International, Marx and Engels held no official position. And even on the General Council Marx declined the invitation to become President of the First International, and instead carried his recommendation that there should be no such office, and that there should be only a rotating Chairman of successive meetings of the General Council. It was no executive authority, no power of discipline which made possible the unique role and influence of Marx and Engels in the early working class movement and workers' parties of the nineteenth century. It was the power of Marxist theory, the justice of their political judgment, the breadth and ripeness of their experience, which gave them this influence. It was a moral authority. When the disruptive anarchist pseudo-left faction organized by Bakunin sought to conduct its offensive against Marx and the leadership of the International by accusing the General Council of "authoritarianism" and "dictatorship," and of seeking to transform the International into "a hierarchical organization guided and governed by an executive," Marx replied in his speech at the Amsterdam rally following the Hague Congress of the International in 1872:

"Who but our enemies have any reason to feel suspicious of the powers of the General Council? Does it possess a bureaucracy? Does it command the services of an armed police force whereby it can force obedience? Is not its authority purely moral? When it comes to any declarations, does it not communicate these to the federations, and is it not the federations that

are charged with carrying them out? Kings in such a position, kings without soldiers, policemen or officials, would be able to offer little resistance to the progress of the revolution, had they to rely solely upon moral influence and moral authority."

Indeed, it could have been wished that sometimes the advice of Marx and Engels, given from outside the country affected could have been followed more closely by the parties concerned, as in their far-sighted warning to the German Social-Democratic Party against the danger of the trend of petit-bourgeois reformism manifesting itself among certain sections, or the anger of Engels over the falsification of his 1895 Preface to the *Class Struggles in France*. Here were cases where more heed to interventions from outside, made with full understanding and knowledge of the problems and in an internationalist spirit, could have been helpful.

While the principle of internationalism is the indispensable and unchanging principle of Communism through all the varied stages and changing phases of the international situation, the forms of organization, association or contact to give practical expression to this principle have always varied according to the conditions of each particular stage of the international situation. Marx showed his clear-sighted recognition of the necessity of such changes in form when he wrote in 1873, commenting on the transfer of the General Council of the First International to New York, a transfer which in fact prepared the way for the final dissolution of the First International three years later:

"As I view European conditions it is quite useful to let the formal organization of the International recede into the background for the time being. Events and the inevitable development and complication of things will of themselves see to it that the International shall rise again in improved form. Furthermore it upsets the calculations of the Continental governments that the specter of the International will fail to be of service to them during the impending reactionary crusade; besides, everywhere the bourgeoisie considers the specter laid for good."

The "formal organization," in Marx's words, of international communism has found different expressions in different periods: the International Communist League of 1847-52; the First International of 1864-76; the Second International of 1889-1914; the Third International or Communist International of 1919-43. There have

been periods of years during which the international Communist movement has operated without the "formal organization" of an International.

The Rules and Constitution of the Communist League, adopted at its Second Congress in December 1847, and signed by Engels as Secretary, laid down the principles of democratic centralism, with the responsibility of the Central Committee, elected for one year and subject to recall, as "the executive authority of the whole League," and required to "render account to the Congress"; provision for "discussion by the whole League" of "questions of general interest" opened by the Central Committee; and the duty of members that "they shall obey the decisions of the League."

The First International reflected the conditions of a very different stage of historical development. Whereas the Communist League had been an association of small groups of revolutionary workers and fighters, united by a common doctrine and a single leadership, there had now developed the beginnings of the organized working class movement in the leading countries of Europe, but with the most extreme variety of theoretical and political outlook, from the craft unionists of Britain, the followers of the petit-bourgeois theories of Proudhon in France, the Lassalleans in Germany to the anarchist trends in Italy and Spain. The universal spirit of international working class solidarity among all these diverse movements, expressed initially in the moves which led to the foundation of the International in joint demonstrations of support for the Polish insurrection (like joint demonstrations in support of Vietnam today or in Spain in the thirties), as well as the recognition by the trade unionists of the necessity of international cooperation for strikes and lock-outs and to defeat international strikebreaking by the employers, led these very varied movements to seek to build a common association. But only the genius of Marx could have welded the extremely varied and even conflicting trends of this early stage of the international working class movement into the mighty united force of the First International, which struck terror into the hearts of the international bourgeoisie. With close understanding of these conditions of diversity and immaturity Marx adopted a patient and far more flexible approach than in the case of the Communist League in carrying forward the principles of democratic centralism and internationalism.

The Provisional Rules of the First International or International Working Men's Association, as it was styled, were drafted by Marx in 1864. These Rules in the preamble set out clearly the aim of "the emancipation of the working classes" and "abolition of all class rule" by the action and "political movements" of the working class directed to this aim. The Rules established the Association as "a central medium of communication and cooperation between Working Men's Societies existing in different countries, and aiming at the same end, viz., the protection, advancement and complete emancipation of the working classes." The Rules provided for an annual International Congress to elect a Central Committee, responsible to the Congress, to act as "an international agency between the different cooperating associations," keep "constantly informed" the movement in each country of the movements in other countries, "ventilate" and organize common discussion of "questions of general interest," and ensure that "when immediate practical steps should be needed, as, for instance, in case of international quarrels, the action of the associated societies to be simultaneous and uniform."

It was within this broadly inclusive and flexible constitutional form, yet with basic clearness of political aim in principle and of the leading responsibility of the Central Council, or General Council, as it came to be called, that the First International accomplished its great work, and the principles of Marxism brought increasing clarity and won extending acceptance in the battles against other trends of confusion. But in the later phase, when the disruptive role of the Bakunin faction threatened the International by its offensive against the leading role of the General Council, it became necessary to define more sharply the principles of democratic centralism. At the Hague Congress in 1872, attended by both Marx and Engels as delegates, amendments were adopted to the Rules to strengthen the powers of the General Council, including the right to suspend branches or federations, but with the right of appeal to the next Congress, and to strengthen internal discipline. "The General Council," said Sorge, the close associate of Marx and Engels, speaking for the majority in support of the amendments to the Rules, "must be the General Staff of the Association."

Thirteen years passed between the formal dissolution of the First International

in 1876 and the formation of the Second International in 1889. During these thirteen years there was no organized International, although international contacts continued, and various types of ad hoc international conferences were held. By the time the Second International was formed, a new stage of the international working class movement had been reached. Socialist or Social Democratic Parties on a general basis of Marxism, with platforms, programs and tactics inspired by the teachings of Marxism and claiming allegiance to Marxism, had been established in almost all the countries of Europe, as well as some outside, notably the United States and Japan. In some countries these parties already had a considerable mass basis and electoral vote. Thus the Second International represented already the acknowledgment by the international working class movement of the basis of Marxism; accounts were settled with the Anarchists, and they were cleared out by 1896; the admission of the Labor Party in 1908 was only accepted after a keen debate, on the grounds that, while it did not accept Marxism, it appeared to be based on the practice of the class struggle and independence from capitalist parties.

The Second International performed a historic service in the building up of socialist parties on the basis of Marxism. Its Congresses became the battleground in which all the great problems of Marxist tactics were discussed with vigor by eloquent champions who were themselves leaders of powerful movements in their own countries. From the outset there tended to be varying wings, a Right, a Center, and a Left. This often resulted in resolutions which bore a certain compromise character. Nevertheless, the general outlook of Marxism dominated the proceedings and decisions up to and including the Stuttgart Congress of 1907, and continued to be professed right up to 1914. The spirit of internationalism received strong expression throughout.

But with the imperialist era the process described by Lenin of corruption of the upper stratum of the working class movement and its leaders to align themselves with "their own" capitalist state and its institutions gradually sapped and rotted the character of the Social Democratic Parties in the leading imperialist and associated countries other than Russia. Therefore the internationalism became formal, an expression of the emotional or moral

desire for peace, but in practice belied by the growing coalescence of the dominant leadership and apparatus of each social democratic party with the institutions of the particular imperialist state in which it operated. The collapse of 1914 was not a bolt from the blue, but the logical outcome of this situation, the exposure of a gangrene already existing. In the name of "national defense" the majority leadership of the main social democratic parties in the belligerent imperialist countries, with the exception of the Bolsheviks, preferred unity with "their" imperialists to international unity of the working class, and thereby condemned the international working class to mutual slaughter. The year 1914 is the classic lesson for all time of the price of abandonment of working class internationalism.

For those of us who lived through 1914 the collapse of the International was a heavy blow, which appeared to us at the time to involve a perspective of a prolonged battle on the part of the militant minorities loyal to internationalism until the International could be restored. We did not know at that time that Lenin had already before the end of 1914 shown the path forward, not to the resurrection of the old International which had committed suicide, but to the creation of a new Communist International, arising from the revolutionary class battles which would develop from the further course of the imperialist world war.

The Third International or Communist International came into existence in 1919 in a completely new world situation, the post-1917 world of the general crisis of capitalism and the opening of the world socialist revolution. The character of the Communist International and its functions corresponded to these new conditions. Guided by Lenin in its foundation, basic principles and constitution, and through its earlier years, and maintained through close on quarter of a century until 1943 with extending strength and membership, it represented an International of a new type. It was basically different in character from the preceding Second International, whose looseness of organization and unchecked growth of opportunism had led to its collapse. It was closer to the spirit of the leadership of Marx in the First International, but without the divergences of heterogeneous organizations which composed the latter. It drew into its ranks the main body of the Marxist social democratic sections of the old Second International,

in a number of countries the entire parties, but with notorious opportunist leaders excluded. Its constitution was based on the strictest interpretation of democratic centralism.

The record of the Communist International represented the key role for a quarter of a century in building up the modern international communist movement, extending now to one third of the world in socialist countries and with parties in the overwhelming majority of countries of the world. The role of the Communist International needs to be seen in terms of the historical period in which it operated. Critics, who have no difficulty today in pointing out the weaknesses in practice of the system of centralized international control or particular faults of judgement of the international leadership on specific issues, are themselves falling into the fault of applying conceptions and standards with which they are familiar, because they have arisen out of the conditions of the present period, as dogmatic eternal laws to apply to an entirely different historical period.

The principle of obligatory international discipline embodied in the initial constitution and operation of the Communist International arose from the historical conditions of its foundation and early tasks.

First, the lesson of the collapse of the Second International had aroused the universal determination of the international communist movement to end with the fatal looseness and disregard of international obligations and decisions by national sections, which had led to the contemptuous description of the Second International as "a letter-box International." To fight international capitalism it was felt essential to build a different type of International, based on obligatory international discipline whose decisions should be effective and carried out. And even though today the conditions of the complex modern world situation no longer make possible or desirable the conception of a single directing world center, the training in the tradition of international solidarity, voluntary discipline, united action of the international working class, and unbreakable loyalty to the principles of internationalism, remains a permanent treasure from the days of the Communist International.

Second, the era in which the Communist International was founded was the era of the world revolutionary wave following the first world war, which was manifesting itself in the series of revolutions follow-

ing the victory of the Russian socialist revolution: the German revolution, the Austrian revolution, the Hungarian Soviet Republic, the Bavarian Soviet Republic, the Councils of Action in Britain, the national revolutionary battles in Ireland, Egypt, India, China and other countries. The international bourgeoisie directed its organized international counter-revolutionary action through its Supreme Council, with the directing of Rumanian and Czech armies to overthrow the Hungarian Soviet Republic, the joint wars of intervention, or the role of General Weygand in Warsaw. Against this it was felt essential that there should be a corresponding unified directing center of the international revolution. Just as Sorge, speaking on behalf of Marx, had declared at the Hague Congress of the First International that its General Council must be the "General Staff" of the Association, now at this more advanced stage the conception was expressed that the Communist International and its Executive should function as the "International General Staff" of the world revolution.

The world revolutionary wave after the first world war ebbed by 1923. But the tasks of the Communist International continued in new forms.

The key lesson of the defeat of the revolution in all the countries other than Russia was the absence of a revolutionary Marxist party of the new type required to be equal to the situation, and exemplified by the Bolshevik Party of Lenin. Even in Germany the Communist Party was formed only after the revolution. In general the Marxist Left in the old Second International had existed as an ideological trend within the existing all-inclusive parties, and not as an instrument for revolutionary mobilization and action. Further, in these conditions there had developed a confused variety of ideologies and trends on the left, including anti-parliamentarism, anarcho-syndicalism, sectarian dogmatism and so forth. The task of development of the very varied array of militant left forces of the working class from the pre-1917 movement, which streamed towards communism after the victory of 1917, into politically conscious, trained and disciplined Communist Parties, armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, and capable of responding to rapidly changing requirements of the mass movement and the political situation, was accomplished above all through the vital role of the Communist International and the collective interchange of experience of

the parties in the International.

In the struggle against fascism and war during the nineteen-thirties the Communist International through the Seventh Congress reached a new height of world leadership of the widest range of the international working class and the peoples everywhere. The Sixth Congress in 1928 had correctly diagnosed this new era of approaching new capitalist crisis, intensified class struggles and the menace of war; but there had been a certain narrowness of approach to the consequent tactical problems of the united front, and Hitler's victory had taken advantage of the division of the German working class. But by 1934 the French Communist Party led the way with the development of the united front and the popular front, successfully repulsing the offensive of fascism; and by 1935 the Seventh Congress generalized this and other experience into a worldwide line for a united working class front and the broadest popular common front in the struggle against fascism and war. The application of this line would vary with the concrete conditions in each country. The Seventh Congress explicitly corrected any trend to rigid centralism, and (as noted in the 1943 resolution of the dissolution of the International) called for "great flexibility and independence of its sections," and laid down that the International Executive should "make a rule of avoiding interference in the internal organizational affairs of the Communist Parties." But the existence of this common international line for working class and popular unity within each country and internationally in the struggle against fascism and war, popularized in the famous report of Georgi Dimitrov which was made known and spread in every country in the world, had a tremendous mobilizing effect to stimulate and advance the movement in every country.

While the international unity which could have checked Hitler and prevented the second world war was not achieved, the campaign bore fruit eventually in the great alliance of the peoples for the defeat of Hitler, with the Soviet Union and the Soviet armies in the forefront of the battle. This brought once again a completely new world situation, in which the old forms of the Communist International were no longer appropriate for the tremendously extended front of the peoples which had now been created. Accordingly in 1943 the Communist International was dissolved by

unanimous agreement of its leadership and constituent parties. Whereas the First International had had to be dissolved after its continued existence had become threatened by internal dissensions, and the Second International had collapsed in political bankruptcy, the Communist International was dissolved by the united decision of its leaders and parties at the highest point of its strength and membership (for the inspiration of the great alliance and the heroic example of the Soviet people in the common battle had brought a surging influx into the ranks of communism in countries all over the world), precisely because its very success and extension had made necessary the advance to a new stage.

The resolution on the dissolution of the Communist International made clear that the increasing complexity and variety of the concrete situations in different countries made unsuitable the organizational form of a single world directing center:

"The whole development of events in the last quarter of a century and the experience accumulated by the Communist International has shown that the organizational form of uniting workers chosen by the First Congress of the Communist International answered conditions of the first stages of the working class movement, but it had been outgrown by the growth of this and by the complications of its problems in separate countries and has even become a drag on the further strengthening of the national working class parties."

Thus for the past quarter of a century there has been no single formal organization of the international communist movement. This has been a period of tremendous changes and advance. It has seen the establishment of a world system of socialist states, comprising fourteen countries, led by Communist Parties, and extending over one third of the world. It has seen the victories of national liberation shattering the old system of colonial rule over the greater part of the former colonial empires. It has seen a parallel growth of the international communist movement. On the eve of the second world war the communist parties in the capitalist countries had a membership estimated at 1,724,000; by 1946 the figure had reached 5,000,000, and today 6,600,000. Today there are reported 88 Communist and Workers' Parties with an aggregate membership of 50,000,000.

This is a new situation. The absence of a formal unified structure or single inter-

national organization of communist parties does not mean that the necessity of international communist unity in principle and in practice is any less. On the contrary, the need for such unity is all the greater, in a period of parallel existence of a series of socialist states, as well as in face of the new problems raised by the changed balance of the world situation, and also in view of the increased diversity of conditions and extreme variety of stages of development of the various communist parties, some of relatively new formation.

During this period international contacts have been maintained in a variety of ways: through fraternal delegations at congresses; exchanges of visits between parties; bilateral and regional conferences, and on two occasions international meetings. At the same time international solidarity actions have been conducted by all parties, especially in support of national liberation, against imperialist repression and attacks on democracy, for nuclear disarmament and peace. The fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution brought a powerful demonstration of international solidarity. The establishment of the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* (in the English edition *World Marxist Review*) by the cooperation of communist parties has afforded a valuable means of exchange of information and ideas to promote cooperation.

The international meeting of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960 produced an agreed statement which set out the parallel aims of international communist unity and sovereign independence of the various parties:

"The interests of the struggle for the working class cause demand of each Communist Party and of the great army of Communists ever closer unity of will and action. It is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist party to work continuously for greater unity in the world communist movement.

"A resolute defense of the unity of the world communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and the prevention of any actions which may impair that unity, are a necessary condition for victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy and peace, for the successful accomplishment of the tasks of the socialist revolution and of the building of socialism and communism. Violation of these principles would impair the forces of communism."

While all communist parties are independent with equal rights, their duty is to maintain solidarity and support one another:

"All the Marxist-Leninist parties are independent and have equal rights; they shape their policies according to the specific conditions in their respective countries and in keeping with Marxist-Leninist principles, and support each other. The success of the working class cause in any country is unthinkable without the internationalist solidarity of all Marxist-Leninist parties. Every party is responsible to the working class, to the working people of its country, to the international working class and communist movement as a whole."

The problem of the present phase of the international communist movement is to find the best means to fulfil this basic aim of international communist unity, while maintaining the independence and equal rights of each party. It is notorious that during these recent years a number of divergences and divisions, both ideological and tactical, have arisen, affecting both the community of socialist nations and the international communist movement. The enemy has not been slow to take advantage of these differences in order to sing the familiar refrain, repeated at every turning point for the past century, of the crisis and impending collapse of communism. On the contrary, these problems, serious as they are, are problems of growth, not of decline. It is precisely the unprecedented rapid advance and extension of the movement in the modern period, the accession of a host of new countries to the socialist camp, the upsurge of new streams of aroused popular masses into the communist movement, which has brought a vast influx from mixed preceding backgrounds and traditions, including peasant, petit-bourgeois and nationalist, not yet fully merged into the outlook of international communism, and finding reflection in various present trends.

But while the emergence of these divergences and divisions in the present phase is thus objectively understandable, this does not mean that they are to be accepted as inevitable. On the contrary, they represent a most serious danger, which it must be the ardent concern of every communist to overcome. Imperialism openly calculates on divisions in the communist camp as providing the opportunity to intensify its offensive. This has been most conspicuously shown in the escalation of the war against

the Vietnam people during these years of conspicuous divisions in the communist camp. Similarly in the ideological field the spectacle of loudly voiced divisions in the communist camp increases the difficulties for newly formed communist parties, and spreads confusion among many who are seeking to find their way to communism.

There is no room for illusions on the present dangerous international situation. It is only necessary to take into account the present advanced stage of the re-equipping and open expansionist aims of German militarism and neo-Nazism; the open aggression against Arab liberation; the extending offensive in Southeast Asia as well as the threats against North Korea; the racial-militarist war alliance in Southern Africa: to see that the present is no moment to disappear into dreams of national isolation and separatism. Unity is imperative to meet the storm.

Therefore the positive outcome of the Budapest Consultative Conference of 66 Communist and Workers' Parties, and the decision to convene an International Conference before the end of this year, is a most welcome first step on the part of the majority of Communist and Workers' Par-

ties to work to overcome the present difficulties and to promote the aim of international unity, both of the communist movement and of the broadest anti-imperialist front. The decision to concentrate the agenda on the "one main item" of "the tasks of our struggle against imperialism in the present stage, and united action of all Communist and Workers' Parties, and of all anti-imperialist forces," provides the most favorable basis in the existing conditions for all the parties, irrespective of still unresolved ideological points of difference, to find common ground for co-operation in urgent common action. This does not mean that the ideological points of difference are unimportant, or that the struggle against imperialism can be finally separated from the whole struggle for economic and social emancipation. But it is precisely through cooperation in common tasks for recognized immediate objectives that the most favorable conditions can be created for the parties to reach closer mutual appreciation of the problems involved in tactical points of difference, and to develop to that full unity of theoretical outlook which is the essential character of Marxism-Leninism.

Marxism and socialist commodity-money relations

LEV LEONTYEV

The nature and the role of commodity-money relations (CMR) in a socialist economy has become the subject of much discussion. Nor is that surprising, for perfecting socialist economic technique, and the economic reforms in the socialist countries are inseparably bound up with more efficient planning and the change-over from administrative to economic management methods, and this presupposes consistent employment of commodity-money relations and the value categories through which they are expressed. It is only natural, therefore, that CMR and their relevance to socialist economics is now being carefully studied by economists in the socialist countries and by Marxist researchers in other countries. Nor are they ignored by socialism's opponents, by the whole fraternity of anti-Communist propagandists.

The economic reforms in a number of socialist countries add a new dimension to cardinal theoretical and practical problems. Elucidation of these calls for a creative approach to the political economy of socialism, business-like discussion of practical experience and readiness to draw conclusions. Naturally, certain theoretical notions based on the earlier administrative forms of management and now invalidated by practice, have to be discarded.

That applies in particular to some of the concepts of the role of CMR under socialism. For several years CMR were very often regarded—and in some cases still are—as a survival of capitalism. They were seen as a residue of the past that persists in the socialist economy because of its immaturity which, in turn, is the result primarily of the existence of two forms of

socialist property, state and cooperative (collective farm). That approach led to definite theoretical and practical conclusions.

First, the idea of the "rudimentary" nature of CMR under socialism logically led to the conclusion that they were alien, indeed hostile, to socialism and harbored all manner of dangers. From this it followed that with the development of the socialist economy its productive forces and relations of production, commodity-money relations would be progressively restricted and, eventually, eliminated altogether. This notion of CMR as a "rudiment" of capitalism hampers an understanding of their specific nature and new content in a socialist society, and a serious investigation of the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin on some of the crucial problems of the political economy of socialism. Nor should we discount the fact that this theory of capitalist commodity-money relations operating in a socialist society helps capitalist propagandists to portray the economic reforms in a distorted light, as a return to capitalist methods.

Practice, which is the best criterion of the truth, has debunked the theory of the "rudimentary" nature, role and place of CMR in a socialist economy. What is more, practice has shown that with the development of the socialist system and the perfecting of its production relations, CMR, far from "vanishing," play a substantial part as one of the economic instruments of socialist planning, the ultimate aim of which is full and all-round satisfaction of the rising requirements of society and its members.

And practical experience, notably the

present economic reforms, provides a wider range for a scientific approach to the problems of commodity production under socialism. True, there are occasional throwbacks to the old, over-simplified approach, but its incorrectness can no longer be obscured — unless, of course, one turns one's back on practice and reality.

A clear understanding of the nature and specifics of commodity-money relations and the economic categories through which they are expressed is of very great importance for our practical work of building socialism. It is especially important for a correct approach to such problems as planning, operation of the law of value, the role of profit and investment repayment, price formation, etc. An understanding of the true character of CMR is important also in our ideological struggle, for it provides a firm basis from which to counter the attacks of capitalist propaganda.

I might recall Engel's famous remark that the law of value has been in existence for over 5,000, even 7,000 years. To that can now be added, with a substantial degree of veracity, that it will continue to exist for a sufficiently long time to come. Does that mean that over the centuries commodity production, its laws and categories, remain unchanged, impossible?

The methodological principles of Marxist-Leninist political economy call for a concrete, historical analysis. This implies not only disclosing the historically-determined and historically-transient character of economic relations and the categories through which they are expressed, but also a concrete analysis of every economic form, every category in relation to its time and place and historical background. That fully applies to the Marxist-Leninist treatment of commodity production and the law of value.

Once we abandon the fallacious method of reducing higher to lower forms, once we set out to elucidate the nature of commodity production under socialism as a higher and fundamentally new form compared with all preceding ones, its radical difference from these should be perfectly clear.

It is therefore not enough to consider commodity production under socialism as being of a special type. That definition is too vague, for the term "special type" can cover a multitude of specifics. The important thing is fully to assess the socialist character of commodity production and value relations, abandon the idea that they

are a second-rate factor in socialism, and one, moreover, open to much doubt and question. Socialist commodity production has many new features compared with earlier forms; a new social content is imparted to its categories and in a planned economy they manifest themselves in a new way.

Commodity production under socialism should be seen in the context of political power being exercised by the working class and the working people and public ownership of the means of production, of the operation of all the economic laws of socialism, the primary role of centralized planning, the new role of labor power in a society that precludes exploitation of man by man, etc.

In investigating commodity production, the founders of Marxism traced its historical development from the first embryonic exchanges to its undivided domination under capitalism. Marx disclosed the economic substance of the capitalist-produced commodity. Proceeding from his investigation of commodity as the product of capitalist production, he disclosed the economic law governing the development of bourgeois society, thereby accomplishing what he himself described as the ultimate aim of his research in *Capital*.

Naturally, the founders of Marxism could not analyze commodity as the product of the socialist mode of production, of social labor planned and organized for the benefit of the whole of society. But their research in simple and capitalist commodity production provides the methodological instrument for that. And our analysis must proceed from the fundamental difference between the two systems, and not from commodity production "in general," which does not change at the most diverse stages of social development, and at best allows for an understanding of quantitative but not qualitative differences.

The distinctive features of socialist commodity production cannot be reduced to the contraction of its sphere of operation resulting from the fact that labor power has ceased to be a commodity and land is no longer an object of sale and purchase. Actually, contraction of CMR is not the cause but rather the result of the changed character of commodity production. And we are here dealing with an objective process, not with subjective actions designed to "restrict" or "expand" the sphere of commodity-money relations. Their very substance has undergone qualitative change,

which cannot be reduced to the quantitative contraction of their sphere of operation.

Indeed, we are dealing not merely with commodity production and commodity-money relations under socialism, but with *socialist* commodity production and *socialist* commodity-money relations, which differ from their capitalist counterparts just as fundamentally as socialism itself differs from capitalism.

Some affirm that since socialist commodity-money relations are "inherited" from capitalism or grow out of old economic forms they should be treated with a modicum of suspicion. But socialism itself grows out of capitalism. The important thing is that socialist commodity-money relations are an inalienable aspect of socialist relations of production. And if some Marxist economists still hesitate to use such terms as "socialist commodity production," "socialist commodity-money relations," "the socialist law of value," "socialist economic accountability," that is only evidence that they have not yet broken out of the old notion that commodity production is a survival of capitalism in the socialist economy.

The transition from capitalism to socialism entails a revolution in property relations: private property is transformed into its opposite, public, socialist property, to become the foundation of planned and organized socialist commodity production, something unknown in all past history.

In a private-property economy, the law of value operates through a maze of fluctuations and price deviations from value. This is not a defect of the law, but an integral feature of commodity production in an economy dominated by private ownership of the means of production.

In socialist commodity production, the law of value operates not in a blind and anarchic way, but as a law fully understood and consciously employed by society. Price deviations from value are of a different nature than under capitalism. As a rule they are the result of a deliberate price policy, that is, of conscious action by socialist society and its State. Other deviations may occur when prices do not accord with market conditions, that is, with the demand-supply pattern. However, this, too, is not the result of the operation of the socialist law of value, but rather of its infraction on the socialist market.

Complaints that in some cases value relations could be exploited by speculators and other anti-social elements, approach

the question from the wrong end. For, first, this would not result from socialist CMR, but from contradictions carried over from capitalism. Second, this would not be the result of value categories being applied in the economy, but rather of their violation and disregard, and this can create a favorable soil for speculation and other abuses.

The commodity, that primary economic cell of capitalist society, contains in embryo all the contradictions of capitalism, which follow from the exploitation of labor by capital, with all its concomitants—class antagonisms, inevitable economic upheavals in the form of periodical over-production crises, etc. Socialist commodity production cannot have such consequences because public property has abolished the historical conditions for converting labor power into a commodity and the conditions of production into capital.

Under socialism the law that the sum-total of society's labor and material resources must be allocated in conformity with its diverse requirements retains all its validity. This is an objective law and under socialism it operates through planning. It was in this sense that Marx stressed that, in a collective-production system, the economy of labor and its planned allocation between the various branches remains a cardinal economic law.

Hence, the replacement of private by public property of the means of production fundamentally changes the very premise and results of commodity production. The whole system of commodity relations and value-categories acquires a new, socialist content. It serves as an economic gauge and as an instrument of effective economic accountability for the national economy as a whole and for each of its elements. It is a gauge of expenditure and results of production at all levels. Without it, rational and effective management capable of assuring optimal solutions for the economic problems that crop up at every step, would be inconceivable.

Bourgeois economists like to wax ironic about Marxists discussing socialist profit, socialist wages, etc., for they maintain that value categories belong exclusively to the capitalist economy. There is absolutely no evidence to support that, and historical analysis—which is the very cornerstone of the methodology of scientific political economy—will show that with the advent of the socialist mode of production, capitalist economic categories give way to new ones, expressive of the new, socialist relations

of production. This fully applies to value categories, which become categories of socialist commodity production.

Disregard of the fundamental difference between capitalist and socialist commodity production is a hallmark of modern revisionism. Its exponents usually contrast the law of value to balanced, planned and centrally-directed economic development. Taking their cue from the bourgeoisie, they usually reason thus: either the law of value and efficient economic management, but without state planning and central direction, or a planned economy with arbitrary infringements of the law of value resulting in mismanagement and squandering of the fruits of the people's labor.

That is a calumny of socialism. The record of socialist construction will show that there is no such dilemma. Socialism creates a planned economy founded on the principles of democratic centralism. It utilizes the law of value and the categories based on it (money, price, profit, bonus, credit, etc.), in the interests of the entire community, and in an efficient manner unknown to capitalism, with its notorious waste, to assure full realization of socialism's decisive advantages over capitalism.

The over-simplified approach to the problems of socialist commodity production and the wrong understanding of the law of value as a survival of capitalism have led to the belief that the socialist economy is never confronted with marketing problems. That is not true; what is true is that the socialist economy is free of the contradictions characteristic of the realization process under capitalism. To quote Marx: "The conditions of direct exploitation and those of realizing it are not identical. They diverge not only in place and time, but also logically." But it does not follow from that that realization problems are entirely alien to socialism. No, they exist and they are of vast importance not only for consumer, but also for producer, goods. Without a study of market conditions, the laws and perspective of market development, we cannot devise a correct structural pattern for industry, correctly define proportions between the various branches, set growth rates, etc.

As a product of socialist production, commodity represents the unity of use-value and exchange-value. This is a contradictory unity, but its inherent contradiction is not antagonistic and, consequently, does not inevitably lead to a clash of the two aspects of commodity, as is the case

under capitalism. In other words, it does not make for the periodic over-production crises that are intrinsic to capitalism.

However, under socialism the contradiction between use-value and exchange-value manifests itself in the fact that one or another commodity might not find a market. This will mean that the labor invested in its production is not socially necessary labor, which is the sole criterion of the results of production. To gauge the results of production it is not enough to know how much has been produced, in kind and value. We must also know if what has been produced meets definite requirements. That explains why in the Soviet Union the gross output indicator has been replaced by another, actual realization of product.

The laws of socialist commodity production are obligatory for every economic unit, that is, every socialist enterprise, implying observance of such principles as reimbursement and equivalent exchange between enterprises and between branches and larger sections of the economy. These principles ensure replacement of socially necessary outlays of labor to each normally functioning production group, this being an important precondition of effective stimulation.

The fact that under the new economic system reimbursement of a production unit or of individual producers is related directly to the realization of the product, to profit and profitability, fills the concept of the socially necessary outlays of labor with a new content. Under the laws of socialist commodity production a commodity must realize its value and, therefore, possess consumer value for the buyer. Hence, the final measure of the social usefulness of the expended labor is taken in the process of realization. For this reason, socialist remuneration presupposes registration of the social usefulness of expended labor measured in the realization of the product, as well as of its quantity and quality.

Socialism is not susceptible to the contradictions of capitalist realization that lie behind overproduction crises and cyclical reproduction. Planning of the decisive economic proportions paves the way for a normal course of reproduction though it is too much to expect that unhindered realization can be secured by centralized means for all, including the minutest, fractions of the social product. Far from denying operational independence to the enterprises, the basic cells of the economy, planned centralized guidance presupposes

local initiative and greater responsibility of enterprises, the production collectives of the people. Hence the incongruity of counterposing the socialist plan to the socialist market. Finding that other part of the social product to replace on the market each of its parts in terms of value and in material form requires much imaginative effort at enterprise level, and definite effort, too, in ensuring the realization of the product, on the one hand, and realizing the proceeds (or a part of them) in terms of the necessary material values, on the other.

Bourgeois economists maintain that the plan and the market are antipodes. They hold that planned socialist economy destroys the market and that, conversely, recognition of the role played by the market implies a rejection of the fundamentals of socialist planning, a rejection of Marxism, a shift to "market economy." Nothing could be farther from the truth.

We know from Lenin's definition that the market is a category of the commodity economy and that this latter is based on social division of labor. That is valid also with respect to planned socialist commodity production. However, it stands to reason that in a socialist economy the market is composed not of private owners, not of capitalists, but of socialist producers, that is, industrial enterprises and amalgamations of enterprises, collective farms and state farms, all of which work not in dissonance, but in accordance with a single national plan that lays down the main and basic proportions of the economy.

By abolishing the exploitation of man by man, socialism removes the capitalist contradiction between production and consumption. However, this does not automatically secure the necessary conformance between the one and the other. Two diametrically opposite points of view have been voiced on this score. According to one view, demand should precede production, stimulating its expansion. According to another, production should always be a step ahead of the growing demand, ensuring its satisfaction. That these unilateral viewpoints are fallacious is clear from the fact that they ignore the Marxian dialectics of production and consumption.

"The immediate unity in which production coincides with consumption and consumption with production," Marx wrote, "sustains their immediate duality." He inferred from this that "production is immediate consumption and consumption is

immediate production. Each is immediately its own opposite. At the same time, however, there exists between the two a mediate movement. Production mediates consumption, for it creates the material without which consumption would have no object, while consumption mediates production, because it alone creates for the products subjects for whom they are products."

The dialectics of production and consumption comes into evidence in movement, in the process of economic growth, when the demand of the producers inevitably increases, keeping pace with increased production, while the growing demand gives impetus to production. This dialectics, wrenched out of gear under capitalism because class exploitation inhibits consumption, is seen in its pure and lucid form in socialist society.

In these days Marxist literature in the USSR and other socialist countries is taking a realistic view of the commodity form of planned socialist production and the mutual connection between plan and market.

Under the impact of the economic reforms there is evolving a more thorough understanding of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Marxist-Leninist literature has proved as entirely groundless the idea that Marx and Engels, and Lenin, pictured socialism as a natural economy without commodity-money relations and the pertinent economic categories.

The Marxist classics never allowed themselves to stray from scientific ground and to indulge in guesswork, avoiding specific forecasts on commodity production in socialist society. They indicated, however, that capitalist commodity production, capitalist laws and categories, would have no place in a socialist economy. And the facts have borne them out.

However, *Capital* and other works of Marx and Engels provide a valuable key to the nature and specifics of planned commodity production in socialist society, postulating the need for distributing resources in accordance with social requirements and the social product in accordance with the labor outlay of the members of society. Those are vitally important functions. The socialist economic system could not exist without them. Yet they can be secured only through planned socialist commodity production and its various instruments.

The economic reforms are designed to

attain higher effectiveness. The due combination of centralized economic management with initiative at factory level, the accent on economic methods, the more thorough economic accountability, the blending of moral and material stimuli and the more adequate use on a socialist basis of commodity-money relations and of the economic categories expressing them — these features of the reforms provide a favorable setting for rational economic growth, eliminating causes of waste and sloppiness, and tapping new potentialities.

The "Kremlinologists" try to create the impression that since the accent is on profit, price, etc., the economic reforms depart from the Marxist doctrine and revolve around elements borrowed from the capitalist system. In so doing, they evade the fact that in capitalist society profit is pocketed by the factory owner, the individual capitalist or the big shareholder. Under the socialist system all profit goes to society and is used for its needs, with some of it spent — at factory level — on bonuses to the personnel, on bettering their conditions and on extending the enterprise and improving production.

Whatever economic category we may take, whether it be profit or wages, profitability or bonus, price or credit, investment repayment or ground rent, its social content under socialism is entirely different from that under capitalism. This is why the above-mentioned economic levers of centralized planning and management are a dependable means of advance, of progress to communism.

The new economic set-up in the Soviet Union and the reforms in other socialist countries are designed to accentuate rather than weaken planning, to make the plan more effective in all economic spheres. They are designed to improve management and to elevate the scientific standard of planning on the basis of the objective laws pinpointed by Marxist-Leninist science in general, and the Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialism, in particular. In short, a closer scrutiny of our economic reforms cuts the ground from under the invention that we are "rejecting Marxism."

To understand the nature of commodities as products of socialist production and to visualize the trend of its further development, we would do well to refer to Lenin's formula that "manufactured goods made by socialist factories and exchanged for the foodstuffs produced by the peasants are not commodities in the politico-economic sense

of the word: at any rate they are not only commodities, they are no longer commodities, they are ceasing to be commodities."

Lenin wrote this during the transitional period. It referred not to commodities in general, but specifically to commodities produced by socialist enterprises, to products of state-operated socialized industry. Evidently, he indicated that commodities made by socialist factories were no longer commodities from the standpoint of the old political economy, which did not deal with socialism, that they were not commodities in the sense of being a product of capital, and that they were not only commodities, because they were bearers of a higher type of production relations, those of socialism. His formula is valuable to us, because it lays bare the dialectics of commodities as products of socialist production, giving an indication of how that economic category will develop.

By showing us the dialectics of the conversion of commodities of the pre-socialist formations into socialist commodities, Lenin demonstrated that, though certain of the old features of commodities as an economic category remain, their content changes and new features appear because commodity production is planned.

The future of socialist commodity production and its transformation during the transition to the higher phase of communism is hard to foretell. It is scarcely possible at present to anticipate the problems that will arise in the higher phase with regard to controlling and planning economic proportions. However, it may be a consolation for us to recall Engels' observation (when answering Kautsky concerning birth control in communist society) that people under communism "will not be less perspicacious than you and I," and that it is therefore senseless "to offer them any prescriptions or to volunteer any advice."

One cannot help recalling Engels' observation when one runs into, say, the recommendation of computing the value of commodities, of establishing value by purely statistical means, by aggregating the actual outlays of the living and materialized labor congealed in commodities. On the face of it, this solution is an enticing one. Accurate computation of the value of products would appear to put an end to the endless controversy over theoretical rudiments and create a solid basis for fixing prices. This, in turn, would resolve many of the difficult problems of planning and avert possible mistakes. Furthermore, com-

puting value would bring us nearer to that phase in the transition from socialism to communism where commodity and money categories will, having fulfilled their purposes, give way to new methods of economic accounting better suited to complete communism.

However, a closer look will show beyond doubt that it is impracticable to compute value a priori and that in terms of theory, too, it is based on a simplistic interpretation of the Marxist theory of value.

The advocates of computing value usually identify value with the labor outlay. Yet the Marxist theory of value treats the two as entirely different categories. True, the outlay of labor is the basis of commodity value, but the category of value is far broader.

In fact, in a socialist economy no other comparable expression of production expenditure and its result exists besides the commodity-money relationship. Solving the problems of socialist economy on a naturalistic basis, notably the problems of price formation by directly computing the outlay of concrete labor, is therefore fallacious. Prices formed in that way cannot be a money expression of value, that is, of materialized abstract labor.

In planned socialist commodity production, the outlays of labor congealed in commodities are an economic, not a purely statistical, category. Computing the actual labor expended to make a product, that is, determining the labor-to-product ratio of a specific industry, may be useful, even essential, to resolve some aspect of planning and management (e.g., problems related to controlling the balance of manpower). But the computation should on no account be confused with commodity value. If a commodity is not realized (which is possible and occurs in a socialist economy too), it means that the labor actually expended on producing the commodity has not been recognized as socially necessary.

In effect, the notion of computing the value of commodities is essentially — in

theory only, of course — an attempt to abolish value relations. It robs value categories of the politico-economic connotation that they possess under socialism. The Marxist view is that the value of a commodity is measurable solely by the value of another commodity, and is ultimately expressed in terms of money. A commodity cannot be the equivalent of itself. Therefore, its value cannot be expressed directly through the expenditure of working time, because the latter has still to be publicly recognized in the social process whereby commodities are measured against each other. That is immensely important for verifying the proportions fixed in the plan and, therefore, for elevating the scientific standard of planning.

The accent on economic methods of management in the socialist countries is based on commodity-money relations, and moreover, on an integral system of such relations. The specifics of socialist commodity production are the key to this single system of value categories, serving as the instrument of economic computation, a basis for economic stimulation and for equivalent exchange.

That socialist value relations comprise a single system is due to their inter-relationship. A system, after all, is more than the arithmetical sum of its composites. Removal of any one of its elements is bound to affect the socialist economy, just as a building is affected by the removal of a brick from its foundation.

As a system, socialist value relations comprise a universal form of quantitative measurement and comparison, without which it is quite impossible to devise effective economic solutions, to run the economy along rational lines, and to plan and maintain the proportions of economic growth. By mediating the social division of labor and the pertinent exchange of activity, the system of socialist value relations plays an immense role in our economy, which aspires to the optimum functioning and growth of its whole and of each of its parts.

The Marxist theory of crises— its relevance today

(Based on the FRG economy)

OTTO REINHOLD

All the new phenomena in the imperialist economy notwithstanding, the past two years have demonstrated that the contradictions and laws disclosed by Marx continue to determine the substance and orientation of capitalist development.

Its inherent contradictions were sharply accentuated in 1967. The industrial output gain in the developed capitalist countries dropped from 7.5 to approximately 1.5 per cent. In the three major imperialist powers—the USA, FRG and Britain—industrial production stagnated (USA +0.9 per cent) or tended to decline, (FRG -2.5 per cent, Britain -1 per cent). The crisis of capitalism's financial and monetary system was expressed in the malaise of the dollar and the pound, the two main imperialist currencies.

It has become customary for Marxists to gauge the capitalist cycle and the depth of economic crises by production and investment dynamics and similar indicators. The latter are of major importance, but there can be little doubt that Britain's economic crisis goes much deeper than the production decline suggests, and that the monetary crisis shook imperialism's economic system much more thoroughly than can be measured by the drop in growth rates.

In conditions of mature state-monopoly capitalism, the financial and monetary system holds a very special place. It is one of its most sensitive nerve centers and, at the same time, one of its chief regulators. That is why many crisis developments are reflected in budgetary and balance of payments crises, inflationary trends, etc.

FRG post-war economic development followed the classical cycle, but up to 1966

there were sharply fluctuating growth rates, without protracted interruptions of the extended reproduction process. In 1966, however, there were clear symptoms of the country's first post-war economic crisis.

Industrial output declined steadily between August 1966 and October 1967. In 1967 it was down 2.5 per cent, reaching its lowest point, a drop of 6.2 per cent, in the second quarter. Investments declined by about 12 per cent and industry was operating at no more than 70-75 per cent of capacity. Employment decreased by nearly one million, and at one time the number of registered unemployed was close to the 700,000 mark. Nominal wages and salaries (according to official data) dropped 1.2 per cent, but since consumer prices had gone up 1.8 per cent it is reasonable to assume that real wages in 1967 dropped by at least 3 per cent.

At first, contraction of the home market was largely compensated by rising imports. In 1966 they showed an advance of 12.7 per cent, while imports increased by only 5 per cent. In the first half of 1967 exports were up 10.6 per cent but imports were down by a full 4 per cent. True, the situation changed slightly in the second half of the year: exports rose by 4.6 per cent and imports by the negligible figure of 0.2 per cent. In other words, crisis and stagnation developments in other capitalist countries were retarding expansion of West German foreign trade. The financial and monetary crisis is raising the price of West German exports. In fact, many West German monopoly concerns are apprehensive lest continued weakening of the dollar and its probable devaluation, coupled with stringent American trade restrictions will

make things exceedingly difficult for West German exporters and will have a markedly adverse impact on the West German economy as a whole. One FRG paper, *Christ und Welt* (April 5, 1968), which usually speaks for the Christian-Democratic Party, makes this comment: "The deflationary crisis which seems likely to develop in the U.S. in the near future could cause a big upheaval in the post-war world economy."

The FRG still has substantial currency reserves, but unlike France most of them (currently estimated at DM 12,000 million) are in American dollars. And to support the dollar and the pound Bonn has been obliged to extend large credits, many of them in gold. France withdrew from the international gold pool, but the FRG government, which followed Washington's lead, contributes to it.

Early this year President Johnson insisted that Bonn make a still bigger contribution to America's global strategy. A supplementary foreign exchange contribution of DM 3,100 million is to be made this year. Obviously, this will further aggravate the contradiction between the FRG's economic potentialities and its expenditure on aggressive policy.

Declining production has accentuated the uneven development of the capitalist world economy.

SHARE IN CAPITALIST WORLD INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT

	1950	1961	1965	1966	1967
USA	54.6	44.7	44.8	45.5	44.6
FRG	6.6	9.9	9.5	8.4	7.9
Britain	11.6	9.2	8.1	7.8	7.5
Japan	1.6	5.1	5.7	6.0	6.9
France	4.4	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.4
Italy	2.5	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.9

Since 1961 there has been a relative deterioration in FRG industrial production. And it is highly probable that this year or next Japan will oust it from second place in the world imperialist system. The gap in their industrial output levels is steadily narrowing, and is very narrow in terms of gross national product: 120,000 and 114,000 million dollars respectively in 1967. Japan is already ahead in several key industries (iron and steel, shipbuilding, synthetic fibres, electronics, power, automobiles, aluminum, plastics and synthetic rubber).

Uneven development makes for sharper monopoly rivalry on a world scale. But

first of all it stands out in crying contradiction to Strauss's plan for phased expansion (chiefly by economic methods) of West German imperialism which, its author hopes, will give Bonn supremacy in Western Europe and an opportunity gradually to penetrate the socialist camp. But precisely at a time when economic power is so vitally necessary, the West German economy is singularly weak. This is added proof that though imperialism has become more aggressive, it has not become stronger.

The West German imperialists, and bourgeois and Right-wing Social-Democrat ideologists have been especially clamorous in claiming that capitalism, having been "modernized," is exempt from crises. That contention is based entirely on the celebrated "economic miracle," that is, on the prolonged post-war high level of business, and on faith in uninterrupted economic development with its guarantee of full employment. This found some appeal among workers, but in 1966-67 the illusions were dispelled. Capitalism cannot assure continuous and steady economic growth, full employment or a guaranteed future for the working people.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of crises is premised on two factors. First—and this has been confirmed time and again—that the economic laws and contradictions disclosed by Marx, Engels and Lenin inevitably lead to economic crises, and today, as in the past, exert a decisive influence on the entire process of capitalist reproduction. Second, that state-monopoly capitalism has modified the forms in which these contradictions manifest themselves, and has thereby also modified the pattern of crisis and of the economic cycle. The rise of state-monopoly capitalism is not the result of the subjective desires of individual imperialists; rather, it is the result of objectively operating laws. West Germany's 1966-67 economic crisis offers a clear corroboration of the Marxist theory and, at the same time, discloses a number of special features stemming, in particular, from the present state-monopoly forms of imperialist domination.

What are these special features?

The new intertwining of economics and politics, economic and political contradictions, has produced a situation in which the causes, the depth and course of the crisis are increasingly determined by the combined operation of cyclical and non-cyclical factors.

Of course, every capitalist overproduction crisis results primarily from the contradiction between production and the market, from exploitation. Every overproduction crisis confirms the Marxist proposition that "the ultimate reason for all real crises always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses, as opposed to the drive of capitalist production to develop the productive forces as though only the absolute consuming power of society constituted their limit."

But a very essential feature of the crisis is the coincidence, or intertwining, of this cyclical crisis with a profound structural crisis resulting from the technological revolution and imperialist policy. And a characteristic of the structural crisis is that most of the extractive industries, and such industries as engineering, textiles and several others, had expanded far beyond present or even future market capacity. On the other hand, such branches as electronics, education and science—in short, the whole infra-structure—are in many cases far behind modern requirements.

Ruhr heavy industry has always been the technical and economic potential of aggressive German imperialism. In the early postwar years it played a major role in building up the might of West German imperialism. The Rhine and Ruhr monopolists were quick to exploit this to enlarge their coal and steel concerns at the expense of the taxpayer. But only 10 per cent of all the computers used in West Germany are manufactured by West German enterprises.

The existing production structure has long been out of line with the needs of the technological revolution, meaning that the structural crisis is nothing new. Of course, the big concerns have sought to refashion the structure, again with state help. The best example, perhaps, is the coal industry. But here, as in all other branches, the monopolies are out for more profits and the structural changes fall short of the desired results. One reason, an important one, is that all the changes are, in one or another way, directed against the majority of the population and therefore provide no real solution.

At one time most of the workers released as a result of the technological changes could still find jobs in other industries. But the position changed with the intertwining of the cyclical and structural crises, which adversely react on each other.

Another contributing factor is the economic consequences of Bonn's aggressive

policy. Marxist-Leninists have consistently drawn attention to the gap between expenditure on Bonn's aggressive policy and its absolutely unrealistic expansion plans calculated to change the status quo in Europe.

The amount of money sunk into armaments, or to finance Bonn's claim to exclusive representation of the whole of Germany, or to finance its Eastern policy, its neo-colonialist proclivities, etc., is out of all proportion to the country's economic potential. And this has hampered economic developments and has produced a steadily mounting budget deficit.

Yet, under state-monopoly capitalism, the budget plays a decisive part in the reproduction process. For it is through the national budget that state-monopoly regulation is largely financed. This applies in particular to investments, research, expansion of the home and foreign market, etc.

The mounting budgetary crisis made it necessary to reallocate the funds of the Laender (State) governments and municipalities in favor of the Federal Government. On the other hand, the crisis was the reason for the restrictive policies of the Bonn government and the Federal Bank to which many ascribe the economic crisis.

In a mature state-monopoly capitalism, expenditure on aggressive policies has a much stronger retarding affect on development than in earlier phases of imperialism. This is so because state intervention becomes the nerve center of the reproduction process. That has to be stressed because bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologists are still trying to cultivate the illusion that military spending and a high level of military production mean higher growth rates and more employment.

For some years the imperialists have been hammering away at the idea that, with the technological revolution, the choice is no longer guns or butter, for the economy can now produce both. And that, it seemed, was confirmed by the high rate of growth, at one time exceedingly high. But *U.S. News and World Report* (Feb. 12) has to admit that the guns-and-butter illusion has burst like a soap bubble. It is impossible to combine a devastating war against Vietnam with higher living standards at home.

Professor Baade draws a revealing comparison between West Germany and Japan. Japan still has a higher growth rate than any of the imperialist powers primarily because it does not have to shoulder a crippling armaments burden. And from this

Baade concludes that if West Germany were to cut its present military spending by half, it would achieve a higher growth rate and much more economic stability.

The combination of mounting and prolonged general instability and cyclical crises as a form of the general crisis of capitalism is an essential feature of the capitalist reproduction process today. At the international symposium to mark the centennial of *Capital*, Walter Ulbricht drew attention to this: "The Marxist law of crises continues to operate in our day. Of course, state-monopoly capitalism has created new conditions, with the result that the law operates in new, specific forms."

It stands to reason that in these conditions every cyclical crisis is bound to have a much more powerful impact on the imperialist system than before. Gauged by conventional indicators (industrial output, investment, profit, etc.), the FRG's 1966-67 economic crisis was a comparatively moderate one, but in many respects it led to major political and economic upheavals.

The link between general instability and the West German crisis is expressed, above all, in the fact that it was preceded by a series of partial crises in individual industries and by a structural crisis, inflation, budgetary crisis and similar developments. In combination, these acted as a brake on the boom and slowed down the transition from boom to crisis.

It is now clear that the end of the immediate crisis phase—evidently at the close of 1967—will not remove, and in many respects may even accentuate, instability and, consequently, breed more partial crises. In sum the new forms of motion of the main capitalist contradictions consist, among other things, in crisis phenomena and stagnation occurring in one manner or another not only in the crisis phase, but in the others as well.

The state-monopoly system shuttles continuously between two poles. The profit-market mechanism can no longer cope with the problems of capitalist reproduction, particularly those created by the technological revolution. Hence the increasing intervention of the imperialist state and the expanding system of state-monopoly regulation. New opportunities arise for economic growth. But one thing this system cannot do, it cannot eliminate the main capitalist contradictions, the particular interests of the various monopolies, and cannot therefore hope to substitute for socialist planning. The profit-market mechanism and state-monopoly regulation come into colli-

sion, with the economic and political power of the monopolies and the trend towards curtailing democracy increasing in step with the far-reaching involvement of the imperialist state in the economy. But that is not all: economic instability increases as well.

Helped by the Social-Democratic leaders, the ruling monopoly-capitalist element went out of its way to shift the burdens of the crisis on the people, above all to initiate a new phase in state-monopoly development. The spadework for this new phase was indeed completed before the crisis by ex-Chancellor Erhard, who in 1964-65 proclaimed the aim of a "formed society" (*formierte Gesellschaft*), connoting formed domination of monopoly capital. Then it was, and perhaps even earlier, that Bonn shaped the essential components of its present-day home and foreign policy, with the top rulers declaring that the postwar rehabilitation was over and that henceforth the country would concentrate on regaining its prestige and such political influence as corresponded to its economic weight, one of the aims being to change the *status quo* in Europe. In other words, a period of expansion was rung in to succeed the period of the recovery of West German imperialism.

Franz-Joseph Strauss, the big man in the Bonn cabinet, spelled this out in detail in his "Project for Europe," suggesting that capitalist Europe should play a more independent role in U.S. global strategy, with West Germany wresting supremacy on the continent in order to gain the right of sole representation, to penetrate the socialist countries, isolating them from each other and, hitching them to the capitalist states, gradually to shape them into a *Zwischen-europa*. For Strauss this latter concept is not only a geographical one. In his view, it would provide the preconditions, that is, the necessary correlation of forces, for uniting Germany and coming to grips with the Soviet Union. Indeed, the book contains practically all the elements subsequently designated by the Social-Democratic foreign minister as the new eastern policy.

Under this phased long-term program of expansion, the essential internal preconditions are to be created by "formed" domination, the home variant of the expansion scheme. However, two things came to light in 1966: first, Erhard and the political forces behind him were too weak to carry the program forward. The opposition to it, on the other hand, was too strong, especi-

ally from the trade unions. Furthermore, in 1966 the boom gave place to a crisis, adding to the internal contradictions.

It was not until the Social-Democratic leadership was enlisted in the Kiesinger-Strauss government that things brightened for the old program. Although the "formed society" concept is no longer in use, steps were taken towards it in the course of the crisis, particularly by Economic Minister Schiller, the Social-Democrat. What these were is shown below.

To begin with, a more sophisticated and effective system of state-monopoly regulation was devised for the benefit of monopoly capital, designed to do away ultimately with the remnants of the so-called free market economy. Among the measures taken in this direction were the law for stabilizing economic activity, the transition to a so-called medium-term financial planning, and the business promotion measures involving the expenditure in 1967 of government funds to the tune of DM 7,800 million for investments, etc.

Secondly, a science promotion program was launched to speed up scientific and technical progress with the aim of closing the technological gap between West Germany and the United States, with allocations for the program being considerably increased. The effort is centered on three trends: atomic research and development, space exploration and aeronautics, and electronics and computation technology, all equally important for the competitive struggle and military planning. The structural economic changes envisaged in this context are to be more consistent and unyielding in relation to the public.

Thirdly, steps were taken, largely with Social-Democrat Schiller's help, to introduce a monopoly-inspired incomes policy that would limit the nature and extent of the trade union demands.

This new phase in state-monopoly domination is complemented by an imperialist form of the system of political rule (emergency legislation, reform of the penal code, financial reform, election reform, etc.), and in the ideological field, too, it is reflected in the accent on nationalism, all these aspects representing a distinct unity.

* * *

One cannot help asking whether or not the West German economy will regain its former high rate of growth once the crisis is over. Obviously, a variety of factors should be taken into account.

Incontestably, many factors will affect the passage from crisis to normalcy. This is true particularly of the technological revolution, spurred on by the struggle of the two systems and the competitive struggle in the imperialist camp, coupled with the changes in the mechanics of state-monopoly regulation.

But many other factors working in the opposite direction, with a decisive effect on the course of the cycle, will offset them.

Marx observed that crises perform an important function in the process of capitalist reproduction: "From time to time the conflict of antagonistic agencies finds vent in crises. The crises are always but monetary and forcible solutions of the existing contradictions. They are violent eruptions which for a time restore the disturbed equilibrium." Any temporary solution naturally sets the stage for a new upswing. The nature and tempo of the upswing depend substantially therefore on the extent to which the crisis fulfils its "purifying" function. That of 1966-67 performed it only in part, and for at least three reasons:

1. The internal forces and Bonn's state-monopoly measures caused industrial output to climb since the end of 1967. Investments, too, began to increase, although they are still far short of the 1965-66 mark. Yet the structural crisis has not been resolved and obstructs economic growth.

2. With Bonn clinging to its aggressive policy and, in fact, redoubling its efforts in conformity with Strauss's phased expansion program, the contradiction between the cost of this policy and the country's economic potential persists. What is more, it continues to grow, especially since arms expenditure is growing too, and at a very rapid pace. Nato quarters estimate, for one thing, that air force costs will rise ten-fold in a decade against those of the previous ten years. Other service arms, too, will cost nearly 400 per cent more. For example, equipping an infantry division costs some DM 1,600 million, against about DM 400 million in the past. Furthermore, the Federal Republic's contribution to the cost of U.S. global strategy is certain to increase as well.

3. The dominant monopoly groups were eager to exploit the crisis in order to improve their positions, particularly to intensify the exploitation of workers and increase their profits through state-monopoly measures, banking on the help of the Social-Democrat ministers. The measures taken under Strauss and Schiller in line

with the so-called business expansion (Konjunkturpolitik) and medium-term financial policies, the so-called alternate budgets, etc., saw monopoly profits rising rapidly. This means, however, that the contradiction between production and market will grow more acute as the economy emerges from the crisis.

In the second half of 1967 this policy pressed down take-home pay by 1.1 per cent, while net profits rose by 5.8 per cent. Estimates indicate that take-home pay will rise by 1.2 per cent in the first six months of 1968 and net profits by as much as 28. The respective figures for the 12 months are 2.5 and 20 per cent. That is what Minister Schiller, the Social-Democrat, calls social symmetry, though noting that consumer prices will also increase by at least 2.5 per cent. True, a rise in basic wages is contemplated, but the hope of any increase in workers' real incomes is slim.

Admittedly, investments are on the rise. It is estimated they will surpass the previous year's by 7 to 10 per cent. The technological revolution, the clash of the two systems and state-monopoly regulation have evidently modified the cyclical movement of investments. Their drop by 12 per cent last year was greater than the drop registered in industrial production, but not as great as during the over-production crises before the Second World War. Although 25 to 30 per cent of the production machinery stood idle, capital investments continued at a fairly high level.

The example of the Federal Republic and other imperialist countries confirms the fact that the investment cycle has become smoother under the impact of the technological revolution and state-monopoly regulation.

The rapid technological progress and the resultant competition rules out any radical cut in investments during the crisis period. On the contrary, the state extends all manner of help to maintain the highest possible investment level. Though investments suffer no steep drop, neither do they increase steeply. For the FRG this means that investments are not likely to stimulate economic expansion. The increasing under-loading of plant will continue.

It is obvious by now that the budget crisis will persist. Despite higher taxes and the reduction of social expenditures, the 1967 budget deficit amounted to DM 8,000 million. It is quite safe to say that this year, too, tax revenues will be at least DM 1,000 million less than planned, while

expenditures will overshoot the budget. At least DM 11,000 million, consequently, will have to be acquired in the capital market, instead of the envisaged DM 8,000 million.

With the socialist forces gaining ground in Germany, FRG monopoly capital helped by Social-Democrat ministers will seek to evade any acute class conflicts.

In the past, too, as we know, capital was compelled to satisfy some of the demands of the workers out of its vast profits. Yet in the years to come the chances for monopoly capital to maneuver will be incomparably less than in the fifties. To begin with, the accretion in production for the long term will be considerably smaller. Furthermore, the cost of the aggressive policy is rising. It may be expected, therefore, that wage-earners will have to fight more staunchly than ever for their economic and social demands.

Obviously, too, a whole set of other problems will bulge out by virtue of the technological revolution in the imperialist framework. This applies, above all, to employment (with structural changes and technical progress accelerating while the rate of overall economic growth is dropping); freedom to fix wages (Schiller is trying by devious means to integrate the trade unions in the state-monopoly system and thus reduce their autonomy); higher standards of education, and certain social rights. The question of workers having a say in management is also certain to gain prominence. The crisis has brought home to millions of union members that they must have a say in running things, both inside and outside their enterprise.

Summing up, we come to at least two basic conclusions stemming from the 1966-67 crisis in West Germany:

Firstly, crises and cycles will persist as essential elements of capitalist reproduction. That the main capitalist contradiction and all other crisis-inducing contradictions may be either resolved or at least substantially mitigated in capitalist society, is an illusion. The crisis has confirmed the Marxist proposition that the main capitalist contradictions are the determinative force behind reproduction, of which crises are the focal points and the reproduction cycle is an essential attribute. The 1966-67 crisis was impelled by just these contradictions. At the same time, the operation of the contradictions and the process of overcoming them is exerting a profound influence on the further growth of the state-monopoly mechanism and, hence, on the forms

of motion of the contradictions themselves. Behind all the proposals to step up growth and restore stability was the implication that the Bonn state must expand its activity. There is a deep intrinsic connection between the crisis and the accelerated development of "formed domination" (formierte Herrschaft) under the Kiesinger-Strauss government.

Secondly, the crisis has been a telling setback for imperialism on German soil in the competition of the two systems. Not only did FRG industrial output shrink by more than two per cent in 1967, while that in the German Democratic Republic increased by almost seven per cent, and not only did the condition of the people in West Germany deteriorate, while that in the GDR was much improved. It will be recalled that the West German variety of the "social market economy" was to have been a step forward, a modernization of capitalism, and purported to be the alternative to the socialist system in the GDR. It has turned

out now, however, that this economy with its spontaneously changing relationships and the "profit-market" mechanism cannot resolve the main problems of economic and social growth in the midst of the scientific and technological revolution. The old illusion that has for long helped to sustain the system has exploded. Certainly, this is not the least reason why the top state-monopoly group formed a coalition with the Social-Democratic leaders, securing their help for monopoly capital, curbing the resistance of the people's forces, primarily the workers and their unions, and blocking the democratic alternative to state-monopoly domination and Bonn's imperialist policy. It is particularly significant in the circumstances that the Communist Party of Germany has made public its democratic alternative, which shows the way to, first, shifting the burdens of the crisis onto those whose social system bred it, and, second, destroying that social system and its crises.

Man and nature

YEVGENY FYODOROV

"Cultivation, when it progresses in a primitive way and is not consciously controlled, leaves deserts behind it." This observation was made by Karl Marx a hundred years ago, when the consequences for Nature of man's action occupied only few minds. Wrestling with Nature and harnessing its forces was then a far more vital matter.

Marx foresaw that scientific and technical progress would one day draw the entire environment into material production, exercising a powerful influence on the relationship of man to Nature. He foresaw, too, that under capitalism this would amount to a spontaneous, uncontrolled, and consequently dangerous, intervention in Nature's course. Public ownership of the means of production obviously offered far more favorable conditions for conscious, scientifically grounded interaction, with (as Marx put it in *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 800) the "socialized man, the associated producers, rationally regulating their interchange with

Nature, bringing it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it as a blind force of Nature; and achieving this with the least expenditure of energy and under conditions most favorable to, and worthy of, their human nature."

Misgivings exist today about the results of man's intervention in natural processes. There are fears that natural reserves will become exhausted, that the water supply will dwindle and that pollution of air and water will become irreparable. The relationship between man and Nature is, therefore, attracting more interest, which is not surprising, because, as we see it, the human race has entered upon a new phase.

Interchanges between society and Nature date to the time when man first emerged from the animal kingdom and became conscious of being distinct from the environment.

Primitive man was confronted by what seemed to him a limitless, utterly incom-

prehensible world. Nature's resources appeared inexhaustible in relation to the modest tribal needs. The elements seemed infinite in power when compared to man's feeble strength. Only a narrow framework was afforded for human existence by the insuperable barriers of the environment.

At first slowly and then at a rapidly increasing pace, the situation changed. The change was fundamental and basic. Below is a general outline of what it is today, how man has established himself on Earth, how he uses Nature's resources and what is the measure of his powers in his encounters with the elemental forces.

For many hundreds of thousands of years tribes of humans lived in areas of some 50 kilometres in radius, with possibly a faint idea of the terrain within a range of several hundred kilometres. Not until a few thousand years ago did the human race establish contacts and some inconsiderable exchanges, punctuated by wars and spectacular migrations, some ranging over several thousand kilometres, yet chiefly within the limits of the same continent. It was just 300 to 400 years ago that man first gained a more or less adequate knowledge of the earth's surface, of the oceans, continents and peoples. Even then, however, the earth's surface appeared as an expanse of undeveloped space with just scattered areas of human activity.

In the subsequent period, the isolated growth of human societies finally ended. Colonial conquests led to the emergence of a world economy and worldwide international relations.

In the past 50 years the exploration and description of the earth's surface have been virtually completed. The elimination of the few blank spots still left on the map — chiefly in respect to the oceans — will certainly be of scientific interest, but is not likely greatly to affect social development.

The various groups of population, growing continuously, tend to intermingle. At the beginning of the modern era, the world population is estimated at about 250 million, doubling by 1600 and growing to 1,200 million by 1850, with 3,300 million in 1965. By 2000 it is expected to reach the 6,000 million mark. Communications, the movement of people, raw materials and goods within the limits of the Earth, are no longer a problem and claim but an insignificant share of the aggregate labor outlay.

World contacts have so transformed national economies that only a few of the

largest could maintain themselves at present levels in total isolation from the rest of the world. All countries have increasingly closer economic, political, scientific and cultural contacts with most of the others. To an ever greater extent the planet is becoming one world. It is understandable therefore that it is precisely in this phase that man has launched out beyond the limits of his planet.

A glance at the natural resources. In the remote past most of them meant nothing to man. Today, nearly all substances composing the earth's crust, and nearly all natural sources of energy, have been pressed into use. Practically all the components of our environment have value. The list of useful natural resources has lengthened, particularly in the past two or three decades. For example, only recently uranium was of no industrial importance, and only a few scientists were interested, for purely cognitive reasons, in the structure of the upper atmosphere and the ocean deep.

Natural wealth is of two basic types. One is regenerative by virtue of chemico-physical and biological processes, comprising water, soil, forests and wild life, of which there is a common reserve varying for differing reasons (including man's activity) in growth and depletion from region to region. The other type, such as minerals, is, to all intents and purposes, non-regenerative.

Most of the regenerative resources have by now been put to use. The general picture is something like this.

Arable land is cultivated to the extent of 70 per cent. Meadows and pastures, whose area is double that of cultivated fields and orchards, and wooded land, which is three-fold greater, may be viewed in a sense as reserve land. True, forest land has shrunk visibly over the past 200 years, and in some countries depletion exceeds growth. However, on the whole, only an equivalent of some 50 per cent of the annual growth is put to the axe. Consumption of *fresh water* for irrigation and industrial purposes amounts to some four per cent of the river discharge, with much of it evaporating or being chemically compounded in production, while the remainder returns to the rivers in a more or less polluted state. *Wild animals*, once an important source of food, survive in small numbers only and play a relatively obscure part in the biological balance. The biological resources of the seas and oceans are so far

exploited only to an insignificant extent, although some sea animals are totally extinct, while others are approaching extinction. Utilization of *regenerative sources of energy*—the power resources of rivers—amounts to approximately five per cent or half the power which could be obtained by the present hydropower systems, while solar radiation, the wind, the sea's waves and the tides, and the earth's heat, although already tapped for power, are exploited only in negligible degree.

It should be borne in mind, however, that in many places the soil, forest-land, hydropower and water sources are being exploited almost to the limit, with water and some industrially valuable fish species and whales evidently in short supply in terms of the world as a whole.

Non-regenerative natural resources consist chiefly of known prospected deposits. Estimates of recent decades indicate that, given modern methods of extraction and the established consumption growth, stocks of basic minerals will last us another century or two in some cases, in others thousands of years. The mineral in shortest supply is petroleum.

Prospected mineral deposits have until now considerably exceeded consumption both physically and per capita (despite the growth of population). The prospected coal supply, for example, has increased approximately sevenfold over the past 30 years. So far the earth's crust has been explored only to the depth of a few kilometres. Our knowledge of the structure and composition of the deeper layers are based on essentially hypothetical indirect data. Exploration is therefore likely to add enormously to known mineral reserves.

A word about the influence of the environment on society and vice versa. Primitive man had few means of protecting himself against the elements and could therefore exist in only a very narrow range of natural conditions.

The happy faculty of compounding the insignificant powers of individual men into the far greater powers of a collective—joint labor and the resultant human reason—afforded greater protection and extended man's ability to survive. Today, man can live and work in any place on the earth's surface, on seas and oceans, in the atmosphere and even in the adjoining zone of outer space.

As population grows and production develops, man is beginning to exert an increasing influence on his surroundings.

This is betokened most tangibly by the energy obtained or converted for human activity. The primitive tribe, probably consisting of some 100 people, could by concerted labor produce the power equivalent of only a few kilowatts. Having developed a vast range of means to convert energy and having discovered many new sources, man now produces power of the order of 1,000 million kw from durable sources. Assuming that the rate of accretion remains the same as in the past 50 years (though probably it will increase), man will dispose of as much as 10,000,000 million kw 100-200 years hence.*

To be sure, 1,000 million kw is an insignificant quantity compared with the solar energy of 10^{23} kw and the energy of the Earth's motion and revolution, and small even compared with the energy of the processes on the surface of our planet, in the atmosphere and in the ocean. The latter processes, responsible for the variety of climate and weather, are generated chiefly by the solar power falling on the illuminated side of the earth, this energy flow approaching 10,000,000 million kw. But the ratio of man's available power resources to this figure is not the true measure of our ability to influence the elements.

The elemental processes in the atmosphere and the oceans—the motion of air and water, humidity and the other inter-related phenomena—affect all changes in each other, often returning to the original state through a succession of reverse connections. Spontaneous reactions and instabilities are frequent, with a slight impulse sufficing to channel a large-scale process along the desired lines.

Recently discovered methods of influencing meteorological phenomena are based on this very quality of the atmospheric processes. To convert the several thousand tons of water suspended in a cubic kilometre of cloud from liquid into a crystalline state, a mere several dozen grams of silver iodide or some other substance with similar properties needs to be scattered in the particular cloud.

Artificially-induced crystallization is now employed to disperse low winter clouds and fog over airfields, and to mitigate hailstorms.

Possibly a similar instability prevails also in the larger processes such as climate-forming. In principal, climates could then

*With at least 90 per cent derived from the fission and synthesis of atomic nuclei, the earth's heat, ocean tides and new, as yet unknown, sources.

be changed or controlled by far lesser energies than the natural forces sustaining them. But that pertains to the remote future.

The interconnection and frequent instability of natural phenomena makes the environment hyper-sensitive to external intervention. This effect—which man plans to utilize in, say, influencing weather—is sometimes attained by us contrary to our wishes. Deforestation, for example, tends to change the river regimes, intensifying the spring floods and reducing underground river intake, while cultivation of steppeland intensifies soil erosion unless preventive measures are taken. The heat emitted by various production processes adds up to an equivalent of some two per cent of what the Earth's surface receives from the Sun. Products of combustion tend to reduce penetration of heat rays and create the hot-house effect, while high-altitude nuclear explosions change the state of the upper atmosphere, affecting radio communications and adding to the dangers of space travel.

Plan and animal life depend on the state of the air and water. When the balance between various organisms is upset by either changing climatic conditions or human intervention, the disequilibrium may have the effect of a chain reaction. That is, indeed, the reason behind the occasional sudden population "explosions" of certain insects and other organisms.

In sum, the present phase in our interchange with Nature may be described as follows: we have explored the Earth's surface, which is now in its entirety the arena of human activity; we have been exploring outer space; we have extended man's capacity for survival by learning to protect ourselves effectively from unfavorable conditions on the Earth, in near space and in the ocean; we have learned to use practically all the known regenerative and non-regenerative natural resources obtainable close to the Earth's surface—some extensively, others almost entirely, and some to an as yet insignificant degree; man's activity is visibly changing the course of Nature, which he is gradually learning to control, even to guide.

Apparently man will soon be complete master of his planet. This time is drawing nearer as we develop the productive forces at constantly mounting rates, highlighted by the technological revolution. The rates cannot be assessed, but that they are increasing rapidly is obvious in all branches of science, technology and industry.

True, periods of stagnation, even retrogression, are observed in some countries, branches of industry or science, but that does not affect the general rate of advance.

As a rule, man is fairly timid in his predictions. He is more inclined to forecast the future course of known phenomena and laws, and much less to take into consideration the possibility of fundamentally new, now totally unknown and unexpected advances. Yet we know from experience that fundamentally new, unanticipated discoveries and phenomena play the decisive role. True, it is senseless trying to predict them, but probably quite in order to expect them.

A similar acceleration is also evident in social progress. Further interaction by society and Nature, as we see it, depends very much on the degree of coordination and unity mankind will have achieved by the time it learns to control natural resources and processes on a global scale.

What should we expect? Western scientists speak of a "population explosion"; "in 250 years man will have expended everything Nature created in 250 million years," they say, adding: "metals will disappear in a hundred years" and "in 500 years only one square metre of land per man will be available on earth."

The problem of natural resources or, more precisely, of their reserves, became a social issue at the time of Malthus. Present-day Malthusians consider the sum total of the Earth's resources a natural limit to social growth. They hold that the yawning gap between the still low rates of economic growth in most developing countries and the rapid growth of their population is the main cause of their economic difficulties and recommend inhibiting population growth as the sole remedy.

This extrapolation of the Earth's population in relation to its present growth rate is highly controversial. Moreover, it should be noted that what people need are not minerals, plants or animals as such. They need sufficient power, food and material. How these are obtained is irrelevant, and experience shows that the methods of getting them are prone to change.

Speaking of possibilities, I have in mind the fundamental possibilities of scientific and technological progress. Practical possibilities, however, often differ from the fundamental, but chiefly for social, rather than natural, reasons.

It will not be out of order, therefore, to look at the various approaches to the problem of natural wealth.

Having proclaimed all natural resources within their frontiers as the property of the people, the socialist countries are taking far-reaching measures to explore, preserve and develop them. Now that the Soviet state has celebrated its 50th anniversary, it will be proper to recall that in the darkest days of the Civil War, amid the general dislocation, the Government allotted considerable funds for geological prospecting, study of rivers and climate, exploration of forest-land and compilation of soil maps.

Urgent exploration of the country's natural resources was one of the main tasks envisaged in Lenin's outline plan for scientific and technical research, for which purpose research institutes, surveys and prospecting expeditions were organized in 1919 and 1920 (Hydrological Institute, Geological Institute, Maritime Research Institute, expedition to the Kursk magnetic anomaly, exploration of the Northern Sea Route to the mouths of Siberian rivers, etc.). Although much remains to be done and many contradictions still persist, the Soviet Union has followed this policy throughout in the matter of nature-protection, and the same can be said of the other socialist countries.

The socialist countries are determined to use available scientific and technical facilities to exploit and restore natural resources at home, and to help developing states in exploring and developing their resources. After years of fruitless search by their British colleagues, Soviet geologists discovered petroleum in India; Soviet hydrologists and technicians are helping the United Arab Republic build the Aswan Dam. This list is far from complete.

The position in the newly-free countries is a difficult one. As a rule, they have considerable (in some cases extraordinary) natural resources. Yet only few of them have assumed control over their wealth since liberation. In many cases, the fight for possession of the mineral deposits, forests, arable land and water is more arduous than was the fight for political independence.

One of the main difficulties is exploration and development. The colonial regimes had not bothered to study, exploit and build up all natural resources. They prospected, explored and used only what promised the biggest and quickest profit. The crippling monocultural systems in most of the ex-colonial countries are the most typical result.

Lack of trained national personnel, of experience and of equipment is another difficulty, probably explaining why in the past 25 years the developing countries, including India (which is disastrously short of food), raised the productivity of farming by a mere eight per cent, while the United States and Canada increased theirs, high as it was, by as much as 25 per cent, and why in 1966 economically developed countries raised food production by six per cent, while the developing countries by one per cent.

In recent decades the advanced capitalist states, too, have been devoting close attention to natural resources. After 200 years of predatory exploitation, their supplies of water, forest land, soil and some minerals are fast shrinking.

This has prompted sensible measures for preservation and planned exploitation of resources: combating soil erosion, controlling deforestation and fighting water and air pollution. Statesmen in the United States have repeatedly posed this problem. But so far their measures have been related entirely to the home situation. In the meantime, U.S. and other Western monopolies carry on with their unscrupulous exploitation of natural resources abroad, clinging doggedly to their overseas possessions and old-time privileges. That these monopoly policies are supported by the respective bourgeois governments is obvious, and no less obvious is it that their policies are bound to fail, for the dependent countries are fighting for independence while the developing states are determined to recover their natural resources from the imperialists.

Also accented in United States policy over the recent years is the desire to gain a top place in exploiting natural resources now in common use, though this is probably less obvious to the casual observer.

Take the following facts. Many international organizations are engaged in coordinating oceanic research, with an inter-governmental 58-nation oceanographic committee formed under UNESCO a few years ago. Moreover, U.S. scientists are broadly represented in numerous research societies of long standing. Yet some time ago, the United States suggested a new international organization, this one directly under U.N. auspices, to coordinate exploration and exploitation of the oceans, evidently hoping to gain for itself more favorable terms and greater opportunities there than in the existing bodies. The project

envisages an agency issuing licenses for use of ocean resources, controlling this use, etc.

Similar projects are envisaged for inland reservoirs. International coordination in the study of global water resources is certainly a sensible and welcome undertaking. That is why UNESCO launched the International Hydrological Decade early in 1964, highlighted by a broad program of research in almost all countries. A special body was set up to compare notes, with regular international seminars and conferences. U.S. scientists are active in this field. However, at the end of 1966, the United States suddenly announced a World Water for Peace Conference. Accompanied by considerable fanfare, it was held the following year without previous agreement with international organizations and possible participants. Speaking at the conference, President Johnson revealed that due to the extraordinary importance of the water problem he had ordered the establishment of a special State Department body to deal with the matter.

The Soviet Union and some other countries did not take part in the conference, because the U.S. *diktat* was obvious. Nor did some eminent U.S. experts attend. One of them spelled out the reasons for his refusal in an open letter. To begin with, he said, the conference was too hastily prepared and was being held independently of the relevant international bodies, affording one-fifth of the conference time to U.S. reports and thus obscuring the possibilities of an exhaustive international program. The United States, he continued, should promote cooperation by international bodies, and avoid pressure tactics.

Secondly, the letter continued, the conference was organized in the name of peace by a government escalating war in Vietnam, causing indescribable suffering to the people of that country and imperilling the security of other nations, while it could contribute to peace much more by stopping the Vietnam aggression.

The vigorous U.S. efforts to gain a grip on international issues related to the exploration and development of natural resources is putting scientists elsewhere on their guard. As a result, purely social reasons are inhibiting effective exploitation. Advanced and backward forms of farming coexist. Arable land is not being used to best advantage. Much of it in the developing countries is cultivated in predatory fashion by capitalist monopolies. The riches

of the oceans, too, are essentially exploited without regard to the future. The existing international agreements restricting fisheries and whaling are little more than half-measures. Yet the fishing industry is expected to raise its efficiency still more in the near future. Some species of fish are even now being lured to shipside by light, then pumped into the holds. And the systems of signals used by fish and sea animals are sure to be learned soon, making for still bigger catches and leading possibly to extermination of certain species. Though the ocean is a vast reserve of so far untapped regenerative biological wealth apart from fish, extinction of the latter is hardly in man's interest. So we could, without losing time, convert from fishing in the conventional sense to fish-breeding or, even more sweepingly, to cultivating all biological products of the world ocean.

Planned and effective use of the main regenerative natural resources is entirely practicable in principle and technically. Work could be launched on changing the balances and increasing the reserves of certain regenerative products on a regional and worldwide basis. The knowledge and the equipment are available. It is also possible to ensure economic and effective treatment of the non-regenerative resources. Deplorably, none of this is done, because imperialism has split the human race and obstructs concerted action in this direction. The unguided, unorganized nature of capitalist society is hindering efficient use of the planet's natural wealth, creating certain difficulties today and auguring many more in the future—especially with respect to the regenerative natural resources, whose use in the economy will increase to the optimum degree.

The other danger lies in the quick expansion of man's fortuitous influence on the natural environment, which, as we have pointed out earlier, comprises a highly sensitive, uniquely mobile equilibrium. Rising heat emission by industry and the injection of new man-made substances into the natural turnover through industrial waste, coupled with a greater use of chemical fertilizers, herbicides and insecticides—all exert a direct, small as yet but already palpable effect on the natural environment, and if the present growth rates continue, it will in some cases become commensurable with the natural processes themselves in a few decades.

In view of the unstable state of the

environment and the occasional spontaneous reactions, we should be prepared for possible, perhaps even undesirable, changes in the present equilibrium under the impact of relatively minor interventions.

On the other hand, the instability of the natural processes could enable us to exert a purposeful influence by limited means. True, the implications may be varied. For example, some five years ago extensive, though groundless, publicity was given to certain successful meteorological experiments in the United States, creating the impression that sweeping weather control was just around the corner. Some political and military leaders lost no time in projecting "meteorological warfare." Harry F. Guggenheim, for one, financier and politician, said that while the atomic bomb destroyed life, weather control could destroy the means of life. Much of the weather, he said, originated in the West, enabling the latter to cut off the Soviet Union from water or, conversely, to cause flooding. Need we comment on this model of childishness in science and lack of scruples in politics?

Soviet, American and other scientists are exploring possibilities of changing the climate. So far on a purely theoretical plane. However, supposing the problem were finally solved and the climate could be changed by the joint measures of several countries, immense difficulties would arise in deciding what climate is the most desirable. To begin with, this would require a single, worldwide point of view.

What is most needed for long-term global measures of this kind are positive social perspectives. The capitalist countries do not have them. Socialist society has: they are spelled out in the Program of the Soviet Communist Party and pertinent documents

of the Communist parties of many countries.

True, under the auspices of the Rockefeller Fund, a group of U.S. scientists and politicians tried to define "America's aims" in a joint paper. But no indication is given there of the concrete ways and means for development. The paper concentrates almost entirely on the growing role of the United States in international politics and the Western objective of "detering communism."

Experts know the urgent need for rationalizing the use and development of natural resources on a global scale. Joint international exploration has expanded considerably over the past 10-15 years, as witnessed by the International Geodesic Year, the joint international exploration of the Antarctic, numerous joint oceanic projects, the International Hydrological Decade, etc.

Such research is incontestably useful. It paves the way to a more effective use and repatterning of man's environment. But imperialism raises impediments. For one thing, it creates the danger of a nuclear war, which would destroy a large part of the world population. Also, it prejudices man's interchanges with Nature and, in time, the impediments will be still greater.

The extensive opportunities for a truly effective use, development and cultivation of natural resources will go begging until the peoples form a single society based on collective ownership and operating a long-term program of growth in the interest of man. However, much could be done now, provided peaceful coexistence and cooperation prevail between the differing social system.

The problem of the interaction of society and Nature will be comprehensibly resolved only in the context of peace and socialism.

For world Communist unity

GUS HALL

The history of human existence is a history of constructing instruments with which to extend the reach of man's own limited capabilities. It is a history of inventions, of forming the tools with which to extend man's ability to reach further, to probe deeper, to understand the more complex. Sciences are systems for such extensions. Molded by past experience, they project the path for new probes, for new extensions.

It is the process of continuous extension of man's ability to reach to ever new heights that makes it possible to do things that yesterday seemed to be "beyond the reach" of man. The sciences not only explain—they are themselves tools that enlarge and magnify man's reach.

Karl Marx greatly contributed to the scope of man's understanding. He provided the instrument to reach out, a tool with which to probe deeper.

Scientific socialism — Marxism-Leninism — is such an extension. It has greatly enlarged the scope of mankind's ability of observation and understanding. It is a tool for further probing. It is an extension in the realm of thought, into the complex relationships, the causes and effects within the social, economic and ideological processes of human society.

Like all sciences, Marxism gathers to itself the experiences from all processes. Like all sciences, Marxism grows, it develops, in the process of gathering and processing these experiences. Like all sciences, it then uses the improved tools to extend the reach of man, to better understand the past, present and future of social developments.

* * *

In thought as in nature, all that has the appearance of an extension is not neces-

sarily so. The realm of thought has its "weeds," its unproductive "offshoots," parasites and barnacles. As in nature, such "barnacle"-like thoughts do not meet the test of time. They are an obstacle to progress.

For a thought to meet the test of time it must contain the inherent quality to be able to absorb experience. It must be influenced by it. It must absorb experience not as a computer, but with the unique ability provided only by the human mind to absorb by analysis and selection. Thus only a body of thought that can absorb can have the ability to develop and grow. Marxism has met this basic test of survival.

This science, this body of thought is now correctly referred to as Marxism-Leninism, because through analysis and selection it has absorbed the central human experiences since the passing of Karl Marx. As a science, it has further grown and developed.

As a body of thought it has rejected the "weeds," has pruned the false "offshoots," and has chipped off the branches that attached themselves to it. Because of this Marxism-Leninism has become mankind's most meaningful extension in the field of thought. It is mankind's most effective tool with which to probe, and so to change that which it probes.

Marxism-Leninism is revolutionary because it is focused on changing reality. Its bead is drawn on the new, on that which is developing. It rejects the separation of thought from action. It is an extension of man's vision because it is based on a concept that reality not only changes but moves in a progressive direction. People who clearly see the path ahead act accordingly.

As a revolutionary theory Marxism does not reject experimentation. It rejects experimentation that has no direction, no purpose.

Marxism-Leninism has developed, it has grown through the process of analysis, the absorption of experience, and the process of defending itself against every possible form of attack.

Lenin's lifetime defense of Marxism was a further development of Marxism. There is a very fundamental lesson here. It was not a defense of a book, of an "abstract idea." It was not a defense of the purity of a thought that was in a vacuum container, that needed to be isolated from reality. It was a defense of its revolutionary content. It was a defense in the process of struggle.

It was an offensive against all "weeds" and "barnacles." It was a further development of Marxism because Lenin forced all ideas to be defended in the framework of the class struggle.

It was not a battle of abstract words. It was a defense of its further development, for the preservation of that **quality of Marxism** that enables it to influence and absorb experiences. Because it was not a defense of a dogma, the very defense of Marxism, the defense of its principles, was a further development of it.

Lenin's struggle against the opportunism of the parties of the Second International greatly added to the growth of Marxism. It was both a defense and a further development of Marxism. Lenin forced the spokesmen of the Socialist parties to defend their opportunism of nationalism and chauvinism against the charge that they were betraying the interests of the working class. He had to re-argue the question of proletarian internationalism. He had to prove on the basis of the new realities that, while there may be some short-term crumbs for the people of a country following a course of narrow nationalism, it is both a betrayal of the world working class interests and the betrayal of the longer range interests of its own working class.

* * *

Thus the struggle against opportunism has been and remains a crucial question both in the defense of Marxism and its further development. Opportunism corrodes, distorts and denies Marxism. It rejects Marxism by denying its applicability to specific national phenomena.

Opportunism never makes its appearance openly. It is always hidden behind whatever at the moment is the most effec-

tive fig leaf. When the revolutionary tide is on the ebb, opportunism tends to use the Right garb. When the tide is at high water, it tends to pick the Left as its cover. This is a law of revolutionary political development. The pressures of opportunism are always present. If active and continuous battle is not waged against it, it will slowly seep into a party and, in the end, engulf it.

The struggle for unity in the world Communist movement is in the final analysis a struggle against the influence of opportunism. Policies of narrow nationalism are policies of opportunism. The fight for policies of proletarian internationalism is a fight against opportunism. The fight against opportunism is, simultaneously, a fight for working-class concepts, for a class world outlook. The tendency of parties to withdraw into national shells results from the influences of opportunism. These are acts of retreating before difficulties.

For our Party, the reality that is the yardstick for everything we do is the fact that U.S. imperialism has become the center of world imperialism. Our point of reference is the U.S. aggression against the people of Vietnam.

We are fully aware of the ugly brutal nature of U.S. imperialism. We have a realistic estimate of what it takes to defeat it. But, because we have the advantage of viewing it from the inside, possibly its defects are more obvious to us. We can see its weaknesses as they are in the process of development. We are as confident as ever that the combined forces of anti-imperialism—which includes the growing forces of resistance in the USA—can force U.S. imperialism to retreat—it can be defeated. We believe this is a realistic estimate of its weaknesses and strengths.

U.S. imperialism and our people are learning the truth about this epoch—that aggression is a costly business. It is costly in resources—in human lives—but it is costly in many other ways.

The high cost of being the gendarme of world imperialism in a period when the world is in revolt against imperialist oppression—the cost of empire-building at a time when the balance of world forces has shifted, is coming home to roost.

This cost is taking on meaning in the unprecedented militarization of every phase of our life.

The cost reflects itself in the crisis of the dollar—in the gold, flowing outward in a steady stream from Fort Knox. The

flow is more than just a symbol of the shift in world relations.

The cost of these imperialist forays shows up in a developing crisis of democracy.

The cost is seen in the crisis of taxation, in the runaway prices, in the further deepening and widening of the enclaves of poverty—especially in the Negro ghettos.

The cost is in the crisis of the cities.

The cost is in the growing pressures for restrictive trade policies.

It is a feature of the present power relationship in the capitalist world that because the United States is the pivotal state in it, it is also the place where the crisis factors of world imperialism are focused and very often magnified. This is the cost of being the reactionary-military, financial and ideological headquarters for a world system that is in crisis—a system in decline.

It is this sharp point of world reality that influences all developments.

Because reality is motion and change, policies, tactics, attitude must go through the process of continuous check and refreshment and renewal to retain the important element of timeliness.

The question of world communist unity is no exception to this rule.

Both the form and content of such unity need to go through the process of continuous check, refreshment and renewal. *

We, in our Party, approach this question from the critical premise that the present form and content of world communist unity is totally inadequate—it does not measure up to the problems of today's reality.

To speak about world communist unity but then to oppose every step that will give it meaning and form, is to disagree, is in fact, to oppose such unity in content and form. Not all who talk about unity are for unity. Expression of unity must take on form; it must be transferred into acts of unity. The human mind cannot, as yet, perceive formless matter, or unity as an abstraction.

The concept of working-class internationalism is also a matter of great principle. But just to declare its principledness does not make it so. Like any principle, it will have meaning only if it has form and content that will be put through the process of continuous check, refreshment and renewal.

"World Communist Unity" — "working-class internationalism" — these concepts of principle take on meaning only if they are "alive" — only if they reflect a chang-

ing reality — only if they have content and form.

Our Party is for a world conference of Marxist-Communist parties. Our support for such a conference is without conditions. There are no "ifs" "ands" or "buts" about our participation in such a conference. We are for full preparation. But we are for holding the conference in 1968. There is a time for preparation and there is a time for holding the conference. After eight years, the time is now.

For the purposes of further probing we want to suggest, a new, a longer range look, both as to content and forms of world Communist unity — we do not make either acceptance or rejection of our ideas a condition for participation in the coming world conference in Moscow. We are not now proposing this as a point on the agenda of the conference.

However, we want to suggest a critical examination of this matter, not on the basis of the ghosts of past experiences — but as a vital weapon of struggle in today's world, world Communist unity is not a preferential issue. It is a necessity of battle.

We do not believe a world Communist unity based on undesignated initiatives by one or more parties, resulting in periodic conferences, measures up to the needs of today. It does not measure up to the tasks and responsibilities of a vanguard, revolutionary force during history's most explosive revolutionary period.

We are firmly convinced that the historic moment calls for a world Communist unity reflected in some organized system for exchanging experiences and for consultations between parties. We want to emphasize, we are for some organized system of relations. But again — we are not for a monolithic world organization.

To get at the real questions involved in this projection, let us discard some of the old ghosts that are so often distracting; as we all know it is difficult to deal with ghosts — even political ghosts.

An organized system for exchanges and consultations does not, and is not, a proposal for the resurrection of the Comintern or Cominform. It is not a proposal for a new world Communist center of any kind.

In form and content they were at best for another set of circumstances. So let us discuss what are real problems. Let us do away with that ghost.

Is the question of parties retaining their autonomous sovereign status a real question now?

Or is the fear that any future organized system of relations between world parties would endanger the autonomous existence of national parties, a legitimate fear?

I think we can all agree — such problems did exist in a different set of circumstances. But there is nothing in experience from which we should conclude that, therefore, any and all organized systems of relations must necessarily lead to an encroachment on the autonomous existence of parties.

In fact, the experiences of the last few years lead us to conclude that it is the lack of an organized system of relations and exchanges that has facilitated encroachment by some parties into autonomous spheres of their brother parties. And is it not also true that such attempts have been forthrightly rejected by the parties concerned? Frankly, we do not believe these are the real fears or the real questions.

It is our opinion that for many parties, the real question behind most of these fears and objections is the fundamental problem of how to fight best against a central and most effective propaganda slander used against the Communist parties. The fear is of how the enemy will, demagogically, use any new organized relationships between Communist parties. This is a real question. This is not a ghost. This we can and should discuss. But let us discuss this and not some non-existent problem. There are many variations of this ideological slander against Communist parties — but in essence they boil down to the charge that the Communist parties are not native, indigenous political forces. That our loyalties are to a foreign power, or to some worldwide conspiracy. That we are interested in struggles for reforms — but only for some ulterior motive — that we “use” our people’s grievances. This is effective slander because it demagogically plays with such popular emotions as nationalism and patriotism. In the USA this slander has been codified into Federal laws. The slander is as old as class society. Every ruling class has always slandered the revolutionary party of the oppressed class as “foreign agents.”

We can also agree that we are paying for some of the past mistakes that resulted from an insensitivity to this slander and these mass emotional feelings.

The question is real, and what is the most effective approach in combating it is a serious question.

The absence of a world system of rela-

tions between parties has not been an answer. For each party to retreat into its autonomous shell is also not an answer. These approaches do not meet the problem. This is retreating from the problem. And tactical retreats always carry with them the dangers of ideological retreats. And ideological retreat is the incubation period for opportunism. So each party must have under constant survey the question of where do tactical positions end, and where do retreat and opportunism start in these matters. Relationships with a world Communist movement are involved in this assessment.

To reject all forms of world Communist unity because of this problem would be a retreat on a matter of principle.

In general, I believe we all agree—the basic line of battle against this enemy propaganda is not in retreat, but rather in the correct application of the science of Marxism to the specific realities of each nation. The line of battle is in a more effective leadership in struggle, a sharper sensitivity to the mass currents and trends in one’s own country, and a correct consultative and exchange relationship with the world Communist movement.

Thus if the problem is not a matter of autonomous relations between parties, or between parties and some system of world relations, but rather the struggle against the demagogic campaign of our class enemy about our autonomous standing in our countries, then we are dealing with a real question.

As we all know this slander is often pin-pointed in the charge that Communists are agents of Moscow.

This, too, is a real question. The charge is slander but the ideological question is real.

How to deal with this is an important matter, at least for us in the USA. It is closely related to questions of the nature and forms of world Communist unity, and of each party’s struggle for its independent posture. But again, let us deal with what is the real question. The real question is not attempts by the CPSU to dominate other parties or of any party being Moscow agents. That is the slander we have to deal with.

The matter is complicated by the fact that anti-Sovietism is a main ideological pillar of U.S. imperialism. It brings the highest price on the U.S. imperialist ideological market. It is a mark of our times that anti-Sovietism packaged in Left-radi-

cal wrappings now brings a higher price than those in Right-wing wrappings. There is a greater demand for it in the imperialist market place.

There are great pressures for the "use" of anti-Sovietism. There is the pressure to "use" what is called a "little anti-Sovietism" — to "use" it to prove "our autonomy," "our independence." This is the price of respectability. This is the price of admission into the circle of independent parties in the books of U.S. imperialism. This is the wedge—this is the instrument with which U.S. imperialism seeks for soft spots in the ranks of the socialist countries and in the positions of Communist parties.

There are many sides to this question, including how to express disagreements publicly with the parties in the socialist countries without giving fuel to this central ideological premise of imperialism.

Here again, each party has to decide where to draw the line of a principle position. To exploit, to retreat on matters of principle is buying fool's gold. The best line of attack is to meet the issue head on. It is a principle of working-class internationalism that you don't take advantage. You don't break ranks for some momentary gain. We cannot fight this slander by unprincipled retreats. It also leads to the swamp of opportunism.

As we all know, there are times when a revolutionary party must fight for a principled position even when the masses do not at the moment agree with it. This is one of the unique features of a Marxist working-class party. But we believe some of the opportunistic retreating is further propelled by wrong estimates of how the masses view matters of internationalism. Some of this is based on old estimates.

One still hears the argument that steps toward world Communist unity endangers future world Communist unity.

We believe this concept has now reversed itself.

Now it is the lack of steps toward greater world unity that endangers all future unity. The lack of steps toward greater unity is a force for dispersal. Each step of greater unity will now become a magnet.

We are for the unity of all Communist and Marxist parties. But we believe the time has come for removing the power of veto by any one or more parties over what the rest of the Communist parties should do. The urgency of this moment of history does not permit us such luxuries.

In the context of today's reality, such

veto powers mean paralysis and stalemate in matters of world unity. Such a stalemate in the holding back of unity in struggle is impermissible. Parties that cannot join collective consultations now may do so later on. The welcome mat will always be out for any party that wants to consult or exchange experiences.

It is also our opinion that militant talk about a struggle against imperialism while resisting every form of world Communist unity is a contradiction in terms. Any serious approach to the struggle against imperialism inevitably leads one to new approaches to the question of world Communist unity. But the opportunism in the attitude of one or two parties cannot become the yardstick for what other parties can do.

Now about some possible forms and new relationships.

First, I want to again present a project that is closely related to the struggle for unity of world forces on all levels.

Without a system of information about struggles, movements and political developments on a world scale, we will continue to limp in all areas.

Proletarian internationalism is a live principle when it relates to struggles. Anti-imperialism by its very nature must be based on struggles and developments beyond one's own borders.

Most of the Communist newspapers do not have available sources of information about political current events.

We need urgently a new, modern, professionally competent progressive world press service. The Communist newspapers, even the poorest of them, could become overnight the most authoritative, most informative papers of their countries if they had the services of such a press service. They could become the source for a new sense of internationalism.

Let me give you just one example. Here is a Communist paper. It has a UPI story about a strike and a battle with the police of that city. Not a bad story. But it has a one-sentence class hook in it. It says the battle started because one of the strikers threw a stone. Thus the blame for the police attack on the strikers was placed on the strikers. We cannot continue a situation where the Communist newspapers especially in foreign news must get their information from capitalist news services.

The growth of the world Marxist movement is itself an argument for some system

of exchanges and consultations between parties of the world.

The simultaneous growth and the interrelationships of the movements for socialism and the movements of national-liberation has resulted in an explosive growth of Marxism. Much of this new influence has taken place in non-working class sections of the population.

Thus much of this new Marxist influence has been superimposed upon deep petty-bourgeois influences of nationalism, of petty-bourgeois radicalism, influences of racism and chauvinism. This is always fertile soil for the development of opportunism.

There is a broad challenge to working-class ideas within this broad new Marxist development itself. For example, could the world Communist movement have been a factor, an influence in molding more stable Marxist parties in lands where historical development has not yet produced a bigger working class? Is it not possible to have some form of organized collective assistance to these parties?

Is it not possible to have a commission for consultations on such matters?

In the capitalist countries petty-bourgeois radicalism with influences of anarchism has grown into a rather serious problem. It is one question that most parties ask about. It has become a problem in mass movements. It is an influence in Communist parties.

Is it not possible for a commission—for as long a period as is necessary—to exchange experiences and be helpful in every way possible on this question?

Is there not a need for some forms of commissions on the role and problems of nationalism?

It seems to us there is a need for some system of exchanging ideas and dealing with developing new problems of the trade unions as well as in the struggle against racism.

I suggest commissions. This may not be acceptable. Let us not close the matter with that. Let us probe different methods. Let us collectively find the method that works. I am absolutely convinced that sooner or later the world Communist movement is going to take a fresh look at this question from a more long-range viewpoint.

And, finally, we want to suggest that all these problems—the system and the forms for world Communist unity, the ideological struggles—all must be consid-

ered in the context of the mass trends and currents, and within the new higher ideological level that is a reflection of the new balance of forces of this epoch.

At least in the USA we are convinced we need to view these problems differently now.

For the present generations internationalism is not a dirty word. World ties are seen by large numbers as crucial in holding back the world from a nuclear disaster. Thus for the millions international cooperation is a matter of life or death.

The development of worldwide corporations is giving the working class a new concept of world ties. Action for peace and against imperialist aggression is seen as worldwide action. We have the most international-minded young generation in our history. This has been a big factor in the development of our anti-imperialist consciousness. The mass media is fully aware of this shift. Only a few years ago our participation in a world conference would have been written up as sensational news.

I don't think this development is limited to the USA. It seems like a logical shift in mass concepts that reflects the realities of a new epoch. The masses reflect the new moment. The world revolutionary process is reflected in new ideological mass concepts.

The effort to achieve unity in the world Communist movement is, in a very basic sense, a fight for the unity of all forces of progress.

A united world movement is a center of gravity for all forces of progress. A divided movement does not attract.

We simply cannot draw fully, we cannot get the full benefits from the new world relationship of forces as long as the world Communist movement remains formless and divided.

There are some who are concerned about the question, how parties should handle political assessments made by world conferences. Some feel this would be interpreted as instructions from a world organization. I do not think this is a serious problem. Such assessments are not instructions. They are not binding documents. How to handle them? Present them to the Party and the public for democratic discussion.

As to the question of what should be the scope of the deliberations of a world Communist conference.

We have an overall attitude to this question. We think a conference should discuss

whatever are the cardinal questions of the moment: Any question of common concern, questions which we should collectively probe, questions to which we should try to find common answers. We should not fear collectively discussing any problem. In the event of us not reaching united conclusions on all matters, this, as we see it, would not be a calamity.

It has been said that we should limit the conference to questions we can agree on. But how do we find out what we do agree on, if we do not probe and discuss?

It has also been suggested that we should not take up controversial questions, ideological questions or programmatic questions. What is left of the political spectrum seems rather narrow. It is necessary to hold conferences to discuss a specific development. But we are against making this into a straitjacket for all world Communist conferences.

It seems to us the base of the coming conference should be the assessment of, and struggle against, imperialism and pinpointed on the struggle against United States imperialism and all related questions.

World Communist unity must not be propelled only by the negative factors in

life. It must not be molded only by needs of defense. *It must be propelled by the visions of giant strides now possible in social progress. It must be fired by victorious offensive battles that are now fully possible. Molding world Communist unity is molding the victory of world Communism.*

History may say many things about our deliberations, some kind and some unkind, but it will in the end judge us by how we meet this central challenge that life has placed on the agenda for us, for all of mankind. We will not—we dare not fail.

The struggle against the influences of opportunism, the struggle for world Communist unity is a struggle to retain for Marxism its revolutionary ability to absorb experiences of struggle. This is necessary for its continued growth and further development. Marxism must continue to reject the non-productive "shoots." It must keep chipping away at the barnacles. It must sharpen its struggle against the present-day influences of opportunism.

By such a struggle Marxism-Leninism will become ever more effective as the instrument with which mankind can continue to reach that which yesterday and today seems "beyond the reach of man."

Unity—the answer to the aggressor

IB NORLUND

It would probably be true to say that no other phrase of Marx and Engels has had the impact of the concluding words of the *Communist Manifesto*: "Workers of all countries, unite!"

A distinguishing feature of the Communists, the authors of the *Manifesto* wrote, is that they "point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality."

These ideas have won such wide recognition because they accord with the vital demands of working-class life and struggle. And they are all the more valid in our day, when the international power of capital and the destinies of nations are so closely intertwined. Today the task of all peoples is to prevent imperialism from unleashing another world war: it would consummate the imperialist crimes against humanity by the greatest crime of all—a nuclear holocaust.

I.

The main feature of the international situation today is intensified imperialist aggressiveness, primarily by the forces that rely on U.S. monopoly capital. But if we wish to avert the dangerous consequences of this trend we must go beyond a mere recording of the facts; we must analyze its causes and concrete forms.

There is absolutely no warrant for the contention that imperialism, particularly the U.S. variety, is so strong that it can impose its will on the forces confronting it. The very opposite is true: heightened aggressiveness is part of an effort to over-

come numerous and dangerous crises developments.

The following statements by the American journalist Sulzberger is symptomatic. Complaining that the U.S. is being "humiliated," Sulzberger writes:

"We have not been able to hang on to our once enormous gold stocks. We weren't able to help Britain save its pound. We have had to trim our social reform program and now wish to tax our travellers and curb our investors overseas. We have been unable to keep the peace inside our own cities or find a sound basis for racial harmony.

"We have not managed to wind up a war with one fourth-rate Asian country and keep teetering on the edge of battle with another. We have seen tiny forces kidnap an American naval vessel and, with all the ingenuity at our disposal, we haven't begun to learn how to combat the techniques of what is now called Revolutionary Warfare."

Faced with this situation, the result of a manifestly unrealistic policy, it would be only logical for America's policy directors radically to alter their present course. Very probably that is the reasoning of such prominent ruling-class spokesmen as Senator Robert Kennedy, who has urged the government to have the courage to abandon comfortable illusions, fond hopes and alluring promises. And certain groups within the U.S. monopoly structure are aware of the need for a realistic appraisal of the situation, if only to safeguard their present and future interests.

But we know from history that at critical moments for imperialism the more reckless

elements often gain the upper hand. One need only recall how they influenced developments on the eve of World War II.

These aggressive forces begin to operate only after long and systematic preparation. They always wait for the opportune moment, preferring meanwhile to lie low. But as soon as there are signs of sharp policy differences and dismay and consternation at the top, they come into the open and act with arrogant vigor. This, naturally, increases the danger to the people, but it also brings home to them the need to isolate this firebrand clique.

Today Vietnam is the focal point of the global battle between the forces of war and peace. The Vietnam war represents a grave danger indeed, for the aggressive forces might make it the starting point of a global conflagration. But the war has also precipitated a profound crisis of American military policy, due primarily to the sterling courage and fortitude of the Vietnamese in their fight for freedom. No one, save the diehards in and around the White House, now ventures to say that the Vietnam war has strengthened American imperialism. But precisely in these conditions the U.S. military are calling loudly for the A-bomb. The ultras are coming out into the open. They are prepared to flout all international obligations not to wage nuclear war. Theirs is the cynicism of the South Vietnam city commandant who said: "We must destroy the city in order to save it."

People everywhere are alarmed by the danger implicit in U.S. imperialist policy. U.S. imperialism is being caught in isolation the magnitude and significance of which is lost only on politicians who have themselves lost all sense of reality. But they are dangerous men, for they hold key posts in the United States. To cut short these aggressive trends, we must strengthen our solidarity with Vietnam and step up resistance to Washington's adventurist policy.

The Communists are extending their aid to the people of Vietnam. The Communists support the Vietnam proposals for a negotiated peace based on national freedom. They are exerting every effort to broaden the protest movement in the capitalist countries to compel their governments to take steps that will convince America's rulers that they are jeopardizing their international influence.

Though Vietnam is the focal point of the fight between the forces of war and peace, the struggle is being waged not only in

Vietnam. In the final analysis, Vietnam is only one aspect of Washington's global strategy. Its failure in Vietnam might prompt it to seek revenge in another area.

This is evidenced by intensified aggression and provocation in other parts of the world. We see the same policy in the Middle East and towards some African countries. More recently it was employed against the Korean People's Democratic Republic. The purpose is everywhere the same—strike at the forces of democracy, national liberation and socialism, and whip up a war atmosphere as a smokescreen for the ultras' aggressive plans.

What the peoples want is to restrict and prevent the ultra onslaught and foil their attempts to bring the world to the brink of a global war. Only continued effort by the peace forces along these lines can isolate the extremist forces and assure the triumph of peace and freedom.

II.

Europe comes within the orbit of these aggressive forces. True, the forces of peace—and primarily the socialist states and the European peace movement—have, by dint of unremitting effort, been able to lessen some of the cold war tensions. And while this should be seen as one of the most important results of our peace effort, it does not justify the contention of those who claim that Europe is now a "detente area" exempt from the war danger. The U.S. imperialists and their satellites were obliged to give up their original design to "roll back communism" by a campaign against the East. But this does not mean that all such designs have been abandoned, or that the European detente rests on a firm and unshakable foundation. For the fact is that a very substantial part of the machine of aggression built up during the cold war has been retained, and American imperialism is directing the effort to expand and adapt it to the new situation.

Imperialism has staged a comeback in West Germany, which is now the strongest aggressive power in Western Europe, and is pursuing its positions-of-strength policy with vigor and with U.S. support. To disregard this would be the height of folly.

The American B-52 disaster at Thule in Greenland caused no little dismay in NATO. For Greenland is part of the Danish state, which has officially announced that it would not allow nuclear weapons on any part of its territory, or in its sea or

air space. The four H-bombs, each many times more destructive than the one dropped on Hiroshima, were "lost" in an "atom-free" area, and large quantities of lethal radioactive matter were carried under the ice by ocean currents.

Of course, there have been many "explanations"—too many, in fact, and they have only added to the general feeling of alarm. It was stated that the bombs had protective gadgets to prevent explosion, radioactive contamination of the ice was negligible, all the bomb fragments would be found, and so on. But many of the "explanations" had to be corrected, amended or simply disavowed. Yet, all this is of minor importance compared to the fact that now people know that planes carrying lethal cargo constantly fly over their countries, and that an accident or error might have disastrous results. How can all this be squared with the official assurances of a detente?

This suspicion of official statements should have set the authorities thinking. The Danish Foreign Ministry issued an absurd statement to the effect that "to the best of its knowledge," there were no nuclear flights over Greenland. But after what happened at Thule it was clear that ment was made in deference to the Americans, but Washington requested that it not be named. Why did the Danish authorities make this statement, knowing that, despite all the assurances, their territory was being subjected to a deadly peril?

Whether the Danish government is guilty, or whether it did not know about these flights does not really matter. In either case the Danish people were being involved in a game that could end in disaster.

Thule is a very grave reminder that we must never fall into complacency. Though important results have been achieved in the struggle for a detente, we must face the facts and realize that we can never rest, never relax our efforts. The Communists are striving for continued progress to prevent Europe again becoming the object of aggressive designs. And they feel that attempts by some elements to spread an unjustified feeling of complacency conceal a desire to prevent complete elimination of the survivals of the cold war.

The major survival is, of course, NATO and its military organization which now, after France's withdrawal, is in a state of disarray.

NATO still sees its main task in expand-

ing its armed forces. And it is doing so in accordance with plans which merit close attention.

The December NATO Council session decided to shift from "massive retaliation" to "flexible reaction." This was presented to the world as a step towards peace. But the fact is that the "massive retaliation" strategy, which called for the full use of nuclear weapons in retaliation to any flare-up, has proved dangerous for the United States and has been discarded as impossible of operation.

But "flexible reaction"—and the NATO communique expressly says so—is based on the "forward strategy": any incident that can conceivably be interpreted as "aggression or the threat of aggression" will be dealt with by a "series of flexible strikes with the use of conventional and nuclear weapons."

That is the underlying formula of NATO's armament policy, the purpose of which is to compel the junior partners to increase their stockpile of conventional weapons and expedite their integration with the forces of the senior partners.

There is also this revealing passage in the NATO communique—the adoption, for the first time, of a five-year armament development plan for 1968-72. Apart from anything else, this will enable NATO leaders to tide over the dangerous period when the NATO treaty expires in 1969.

It was further decided to pay special attention to safeguarding the flanks of the Allied command in Europe. What is implied has been clearly illustrated by the events in Greenland and the Eastern Mediterranean. Heightened NATO activity in northern Norway and moves towards a FRG-Danish united command for the Baltic area show that NATO is also concerned for its northern flanks.

Last but not least, the new joint Atlantic naval force will be able to operate on the flanks too.

These measures are signs that the more aggressive imperialist elements have found a way to tightening their control over the military machine of the smaller NATO countries, which are now being made to step up their arms drive and can be involved in incidents on NATO's flanks.

The very fact that these measures have been taken (though under cover of florid statements about NATO being a "detente instrument") suggested that the immediate aim is to enable NATO to bypass

some of the dangerous obstacles that are bound to arise in 1969.

Can NATO serve as a detente instrument? The question was put a year ago, and K. Helveg Petersen, then Danish government adviser on disarmament and now Minister of Culture with certain foreign policy responsibilities, gave this reply:

"I am not too sure that NATO can be used for this purpose. Its leaders often tell us it is dangerous to think in terms of a detente, for that only weakens NATO. At any rate, it has to be said that military aims determine both its structure and functions."

All the internal friction notwithstanding, NATO continues to be the principal instrument of American interference and aggression in Europe.

NATO presents a constant and mounting danger, for U.S. and West German imperialism—and more especially the extremists in both countries—effect their cooperation through NATO.

West Germany is the only European country seeking boundary revision and revenge. And Washington is using it as a trump in its aggressive game in Europe. By large investments of capital, the U.S. has assured itself a strong economic position in Federal Germany and maintains close links with its monopoly concerns. There is also extensive cooperation in the military and intelligence fields.

This alliance of U.S. and West German monopoly and militarist forces is the most dangerous aggressive reactionary force in Europe. Its immediate target is the German Democratic Republic, but it is also an ever-present threat to European security and the democratic and other rights won by the peoples of Europe.

NATO is the chief instrument in these sinister plans and designs. That was made plain enough by the military coup in Greece, a coup carried out in accordance with the NATO Prometheus plan and by NATO-subordinated units equipped with NATO arms. The Italian press reported that a similar plan had been drawn up for Italy and was very nearly put into effect by a group of reactionary generals. Their conspiracy was exposed in the press and they were put on trial.

In West Germany the so-called emergency laws are designed to serve the same purpose—no wonder the government is trying so hard to crush public resistance to their enactment. The latest manifestation of this is its measure to prevent the public

from learning of the new Communist Party program which charts the country's path to progress in peace and democracy.

In all other NATO countries "potential subversives" are being registered and measures taken to "render them harmless" in an "emergency." There is every reason to suppose that detailed plans to abolish all democratic rights have been worked out in every NATO country.

Faced with a more aggressive U.S. imperialism, it is important to keep constant watch on how its policies are carried out through European institutions specially created for the purpose. Much more has to be done to expose and counter all the plans and actions of the aggressive forces; that is part of the battle for peace and democracy. The Communists consider it their duty to draw the attention of the working class and peoples of Europe to the reactionary forces at work within the U.S. imperialist structure and show how they influence U.S. policy.

No amount of fine words by U.S. and other Western politicians about peace and democracy can conceal their perilous game. The main thing here is to expose and isolate the more rabid enemies of peace and democracy.

The Communist Parties are working to promote European security. The demand for a status quo on the European boundary issue should not be equated with a status quo in the fight for peace. For to accept this status quo would give the aggressors more time and opportunities to continue their preparations, which can have the most calamitous results.

That is why the Communists are working to change the pattern of international relations in Europe, which was set at the height of the cold war, and bring it into line with present-day conditions. In this situation, the Karlovy Vary European security program acquires especial importance. The future will largely depend on whether or not the governments, notably of NATO countries, take concrete and concerted steps to strengthen European security. And the main force capable of compelling them to move in that direction is a strong popular movement for a radical change in Europe.

III.

U.S. imperialism's aggressiveness is meeting with more resolute resistance from the people. Protests are widespread and are

developing into a broad and vigorous mass movement capable of producing political results. That applies in particular to the Vietnam solidarity movements in many countries. The decisive thing here is to give these movements the strength, determination and preserverance needed to bar the way to aggression.

The Communists are alive to their special responsibility for broadening and strengthening these mass movements. They have a clear understanding of the alignment and potentialities of the forces that determine the present international situation, and this makes their contribution all the more valuable. The Communist Parties, being parties of the working class, play a big role in uniting and organizing the democratic and mass struggle.

The crucial factor in fulfilling the tasks posed by the present situation is international unity of the Communist Parties. The reactionaries are well aware of that, and there can be no doubt that the U.S. imperialists have exploited cleavages in the Communist movement to pursue a more reckless policy.

Unity of such a broad and great movement as the Communist movement cannot, and does not, mean identical views on all issues without exception. Much will depend on the ability constructively to discuss the pressing issues. But unity does imply agreement on what is basic, essential and cardinal to the solution of our present tasks. This refers in particular to the struggle against world imperialism, of which U.S. imperialism is now the main force. Inasmuch as we are dealing with parties sharing one and the same class basis and one and the same ideology, Marxism-Leninism, the objective conditions exist for their maximum unity in coping with these central problems, which are common to all of them and are not determined by some special factors.

The Communist movement has, notably in recent years, demonstrated its ability to achieve unity in forms that correspond to the problems it has to face. And this brings us to the Karlovy Vary Conference of European Communist Parties. Though the conference brought together parties working in different conditions, in socialist and capitalist countries, it was able to work out common views on issues of vital importance to every European country. It was of immense value to all parties, including those which did not participate.

The positive experience of the Karlovy Vary meeting paved the way for the step towards closer unity taken at the Budapest

consultative meeting. Delegates from 66 countries gathered in the Hungarian capital decided to begin preparations for an international conference open to all Communist parties, to be held at the end of the year. It will discuss the tasks involved in the fight against imperialism at the present stage and for united action by Communist and Workers' parties, by all the anti-imperialist forces.

The Budapest meeting confirmed that the way to unity in the complex conditions of our time lies through open exchange of views, with full respect for the equality and independence of all the Parties. Given these conditions, and the will to achieve mutual understanding, many differences can be ironed out, much of the misunderstanding removed, and dangerous estrangement eliminated. That was the prevailing spirit in Budapest.

It is no secret, of course, that for several years now unity of the international Communist movement has left much to be desired. The significance of the Budapest meeting lies in the practical measures it suggested to reverse that trend.

It would be wrong, however, to believe that the obstacles can be immediately removed. The matter of unity is closely associated with objective difficulties stemming from the growth of the movement and extension of the Parties, which work in varying conditions. Another factor is the emergence of new problems requiring creative solutions. However, there are practical ways and means of surmounting all the obstacles.

United action in the fight against imperialism, which the Communist Parties have made the focal point of all their efforts, is more necessary than ever. And there is also this: united action, as experience has shown, is the tried and tested means of achieving a wider unity that will convert the latest strength of the Communist movement into an effective politico-ideological force in world affairs.

Intensified imperialist aggressiveness is attended by other phenomena which show up the capitalist system for what it really is. But they show, too, that capitalism has lived out its day. A few years ago not many would have envisaged that U.S. imperialism would be waging the most savage and destructive war ever waged against a small nation. And few would have predicted that in America itself a sizable segment of the population would be subjected to repressive measures reminiscent of civil war.

The danger is that gradually all this might come to be taken for granted and not meet with adequate resistance.

It is therefore vitally necessary that certain notions carried over from the past be discarded, or at any rate relegated to the background. We are living in times that imperatively call for joint initiative to bar the road to the most reactionary forces of the old society. In the past the Communists were able to take this initiative on an international scale, and today, too, they are working to bring together all the anti-im-

perialist forces.

The meaning and value of the decisions of the international conference now being prepared by the collective effort of the Communist parties will be determined by their power of attraction. The guarantee of the conference's success is unremitting effort in the eternally young and eternally creative spirit of the Marxist ideas. And in this context it is fitting and proper to recall Marx's thought that real progress in the struggle is much more important than hundreds of programs.

Vietnam: the strength of a people

The sweeping February-March offensive of the South Vietnam Liberation forces was an unmistakable sign of the upsurge in the battle against imperialist aggression. Risings in U.S.-occupied towns, breakdown of the Saigon administration, popular government in the newly-liberated areas, the emergence of new patriotic organizations—all testify to that which U.S. propaganda had been at pains to obscure or discount, namely, that Washington's adversary in South Vietnam is the overwhelming majority of the people fighting under NLF leadership to oust the aggressor.

U.S. propaganda has all along sought to depict the National Liberation Front as representing merely a small group of Communists. The truth, however—and this is confirmed by recent developments—is that the NLF speaks for the people of South Vietnam. It has brought together political and mass organizations active both in the liberated and in the occupied areas.

The National Liberation Front was founded in 1960. It is composed of the Democratic Party, which speaks for the progressive national bourgeoisie; the Radical Socialist Party, made up largely of patriotic intellectuals; the Labor Liberation Association, the Peasant Liberation Alliance, Association of Former Resistance Fighters, the Students' Liberation League, the Young Liberation Union, the Women's Alliance for

Liberation, Association of Literature and the Arts, and other organizations, more than 20 in all.

The NLF acquired new strength with the affiliation of the Popular Revolutionary Party (PRP), a close-knit organization of revolutionaries, labor activists, peasant leaders and prominent intellectuals, which subscribes to the NLF program.

The new NLF program, proclaimed last August, gives voice to the interests of the working class and peasantry, national bourgeoisie, professionals and other sections of the population that want an end to imperialist aggression and a country living in independence and democracy.

The National Liberation Front is the accepted leader of the popular resistance to the reactionary terror and the American invasion. To all intents and purposes, it is a provisional popular coalition government, the only true representatives of the South Vietnamese people. It supervises the economic and cultural life of the liberated areas,—and they make up more than two-thirds of the country. It has active international contacts and enjoys worldwide prestige.

The Front's chief concern today is to organize and direct the armed and political struggle against the aggressor and his quislings. The Liberation Army numbers hundreds of thousands, and together with the Home Guard in the liberated areas,

and guerrilla detachments and combat groups operating in the occupied territory, its total muster is in excess of one million.

NLF activity has the support of a number of unaffiliated patriotic organizations. Among these mention should be made of the Buddhist and student groups in the towns. It will be recalled that on more than one occasion the Buddhists shook the very foundations of the puppet government and caused consternation among its American paymasters. The Buddhist action of 1963 was one of the chief causes of the collapse of the Diem dictatorship. The Buddhists also played a conspicuous part in the 1966 spring rising in the northern provinces of South Vietnam.

More patriotic organizations supporting the NLF were formed during the February offensive. In Saigon, for instance, the Union of National Peace Forces was joined by representatives of various sections of the population. The National Democratic Peace Front, formed in liberated Hue, convened an emergency National Salvation Congress which appointed a People's Revolutionary Committee for Thuathien province and Hue.

Militarily the U.S. was able to oppose to these forces a more than half-million strong army of its own and satellite troops. But it has no political answer, no realistic political force in South Vietnam. Washington's strategy was predicated on the theory that the vacuum between the South Vietnam people and the foreign invader would be filled by the government of quislings. That has been central to American policy in the 14 years since the Geneva Agreements were concluded in 1954.

U.S. propaganda has been hard at work trying to prove to world opinion that a "legal" Saigon government had "invited" the U.S. to defend South Vietnam against foreign Communist aggression. Throughout these years Washington has used military force to give its Saigon puppets a semblance of legality and has used their "invitation" as a pretext for an all-out military campaign against the national-liberation movement in Indo-China.

Whatever support the U.S. has comes from reactionary landowners, pro-American compradore bourgeoisie, bureaucratic officialdom, the militarist clique, and some reactionary Catholics. Washington staked heavily on the reactionary politicians and army officers who fled the North after 1954.

A government relying on quisling elements could only be a military-bureaucratic dictatorship, the kind of government that

emerges, in Lenin's words, "when there is no solid, durable and tested integral social basis, and when there is a need to maneuver among heterogeneous elements." The thirteen Saigon governments that have succeeded each other over the past five years fully fit into that description. And no amount of American political manipulation, no election farces, no bogus "constitutions" and "rural pacification" programs can alter the character of the puppet regime or give it a modicum of popular support.

And more far-seeing American politicians admit this. There is the statement by Robert F. Kennedy that the U.S. is "supporting a government without supporters. Without the efforts of American arms that government would not last a day."

From the very outset, the U.S. made a special effort to "stabilize" the Saigon regime and "pacify" the population, that is, suppress all anti-imperialist action and crush the people's struggle.

General Maxwell Taylor, an expert on local wars and anti-guerrilla operations, drew up a comprehensive "pacification program" that was supposed to produce results within 18 months. The idea was to build up a large Saigon Army generously financed and carefully trained by the U.S., and composed of reactionaries, ex-officers, declassified elements, "refugees" from the North and peasant conscripts.

There is no point in recounting the failure of the plan. Suffice it to say that there are no "pacified" villages or towns in South Vietnam—recent developments are ample proof of that. And it should not be hard to see why the plan fell through. It was based on terror, forcible "resettlement" of peasants in the so-called strategic hamlets, a euphemism for concentration camps. This, naturally, met with determined resistance, which developed into peasant guerrilla warfare.

Recent developments in Vietnam show that the U.S. cannot impose its control.

America stands no chance of winning the war. Hans Morgenthau, an expert on international affairs, says in South Vietnam the United States is confronted by "a nation-in-arms, in a war which can be won only by incapacitating the total population."

And this from the Italian Communist weekly *Rinascita*: "Stripped of its mask, U.S. imperialism stands alone, with all its napalm bombs, chemical weapons, its wanton bombings of the North and South, its brutal 'combing' of villages and its con-

centration camps for aged men, women and children . . ."

In fact, even supporters of Washington's policy find themselves obliged to admit that it has no social base in South Vietnam. And U.S. politicians who take a more sober view of things frankly say that there can be no settlement without the participation of the National Liberation Front.

The new upsurge of the liberation struggle is one more demonstration that there is no vanquishing a people fighting in a just cause. And in their just cause the

South Vietnamese can count on the mounting support of the world's progressive forces. The representatives of 67 Communist and Workers' parties declared in the solidarity statement issued at the Consultative Meeting in Budapest: "On behalf of our parties, on behalf of the millions of our supporters, we reaffirm our inflexible resolve to give all support to the people of Vietnam who are in the forefront of the armed struggle against imperialism."

Jan PRAZSKY

A deep-going crisis

To say that the United States is in deep trouble would be the understatement of the year. The phrase, descriptive though it is, is a long way from describing fully the crisis of many dimensions that has overtaken the biggest capitalist country of the world. Not since the American Civil War has there been a period in which the United States has experienced so many simultaneous convulsions.

The root of the trouble is the Vietnamese war. That war, waged in a far away country against an adversary who, theoretically, should have been crushed long ago, and prosecuted with all the technological power of the most technological of all the capitalist countries, has caused more strains in the United States than anything else in its history. Permeating every aspect of American life, it has divided the country into antagonistic camps; it has changed the proportions of the economy leading to a deep-going dollar crisis.

The war in Vietnam has turned out to be completely different from all the other wars waged by the United States. This difference has two aspects. One was, and is, the utter hopelessness of a U.S. military victory, the other—the effect on the economy in its relation to the outside world.

The Tet offensive in Vietnam changed the proportions of the war. It showed that the entire American effort has been fruitless, and it involved in the bloodshed elements of the U.S. army usually immune to the dangers of the battlefield. The American draft system is such that the sons of

the rich are excluded from the draft—mostly through college deferment — or, finding themselves in South Vietnam had had a relatively good time in the Saigon bureaucracy, in the logistical, administrative and propaganda machinery. The Tet offensive disrupted the pattern; it brought the war to the air-conditioned rooms in the Saigon hotels and apartments; it tore down "la dolce vita" of the American brass.

The utter confusion of both the Americans and their Saigon puppets was demonstrated by two facts: the Saigon police guarding the American Embassy opened fire on their American allies; and the "rumor mill" of Saigon ground out a fantastic report: the Americans were in collusion with . . . the Viet-Cong for it would have been otherwise impossible for the Liberation Front to have waged so successful an offensive.

The events had a terrific impact on the domestic scene in Washington. Some of the bourgeoisie for the first time saw themselves involved in the war not only economically but also physically: their sons began to die on the battlefield. The Tet offensive emphasized the discrepancy between the United States and other capitalist countries: while America was bleeding white both because of battlefield casualties and the "gold rush," its allies were beginning to regain the positions of which Big Brother had previously deprived them.

The French *Le Nouvel Observateur* reported on February 28 that a powerful

segment of U.S. financial circles had reached the conclusion that the Vietnam war threatened both the economic position and the world-power status of the United States. The president of the Chase Manhattan Bank David Rockefeller took the position of leadership in trying to disentangle the United States from the hopeless war. The March 8 issue of *Wall Street Journal* appeared with a remarkable headline: "Dovish Wall Street"; the article pointed out that for two years the Stock Market had been reacting bullishly to peace rumors, and had slumped with escalation. The danger of inflation, the deficit in the balance of payments and the possibility of Government imposed economic controls made investors jumpy, frustrated and unhappy.

This was something completely new. Until now every war fought by the United States had sent the New York Stock Exchange soaring; the stock market was bullish, for war signified prosperity for the big corporations. Because of the new character of the Vietnam war the picture had reversed; and the *Wall Street Journal* noted that anti-war demonstrations emerged in the very place that seemed most improbable: on a small but important street in New York City.

These views are explained by the deep economic and financial crisis that has engulfed America. The run on gold, which of course mean a *flight* from the dollar, shook the financial markets of the capitalist world. Panic ensued. At the request of President Johnson London closed its gold market for three days. The U.S. Senate voted to drop the gold coverage of American bank notes in circulation which is supposed to free about 10 billion dollars to maintain the gold price of 35 dollars an ounce. The Federal Reserve System of the United States raised its discount rate to five per cent—the highest level since Black Monday of 1929. A special meeting of central bankers was summoned, literally at a moment's notice, to try to find a solution.

It would be difficult to overstate the significance of those developments. The dollar has always been regarded as the most stable currency throughout the capitalist world. For Americans it was simply unthinkable that their dollar could lose the confidence of the world. Americans were proud that they had hardly any currency controls, of their free flow of capital in every possible way. They thought their resources to be unlimited and originally

looked upon the Vietnam war as a welcome support of their economic power and prosperity. All this became a myth—if not overnight then in a surprisingly short time.

Then came the New Hampshire primaries, the spectacular victory of the "peace-through negotiations" candidate, Senator Eugene J. McCarthy and, consequently, the decision of Senator Robert Kennedy to run. McCarthy made the American youth emerge as a political force. James Reston, writing in the *International Herald Tribune* of March 11, (i.e., before the New Hampshire primary) had this to say about the youthful supporters of Senator McCarthy: "They are demanding plain statements of belief from their presidential politicians. They are suspicious about the modern trend of 'leaving things out' and want the political picture clear. . . . They are likely to play an important *and may be even a decisive role* . . . in the two political party conventions in August. The protest movement against the war . . . is going into a new phase. It is moving from debates and sit-ins to practical political action, from propaganda protests to tedious hard work in the precincts."

The processes of which both the financial press and Reston spoke became so strong that they forced the hand of President Johnson to make a decision which literally flabbergasted everybody: Johnson quit the presidential race. And he coupled it with a limited offer of suspending the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in order to enter into negotiations. It was a hypocritical offer, for the bombing still goes on; but the Hanoi Government, displaying political wisdom, agreed to establish contact with the United States with a view to bringing about the complete cessation of the bombing and of all the other hostile acts against North Vietnam.

The utter failure of U.S. policy in Vietnam and in regard to its own social problems has stirred the ultra reactionaries. It would seem that elements of this kind were behind the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, a crime reminiscent of the Kennedy assassination. But it was also a crime that showed the extent of the degeneration of the political and moral climate in the United States.

America, it would seem, has reached a turning point in its history. And has reached it because of a war which has brought upon it a terrible defeat, and because it has failed so far to cure its most pressing social program.

Zygmunt BRONIAREK

New phase in the struggle of the Cypriot people

E. PAPAIOANNOU

The national liberation, anti-imperialist struggle of our people has entered upon a new phase.

When the two-year Greco-Turkish dialogue, that is, when the attempts of the imperialists to solve the Cyprus question by partitioning the island in the guise of *Enosis*, ended in failure, the fascist junta in Athens, egged on by the U.S. imperialists, initiated a new round of talks, this time on the banks of the Maritsa, near the Greco-Turkish frontier. However, these too ended in a fiasco. The junta had hoped that the reactionary rulers in Ankara would agree to *Enosis* in return for a military base in Cyprus and an alliance against the USSR and the other socialist countries. The Turkish rulers, however, wanted much more than that. *Enosis*, they insisted, would have to be a dual process, with a large part of Cyprus becoming a Turkish possession.

After the failure of the deal the imperialists, and specifically the U.S. imperialists, engineered further clashes between Greeks and Turks in Ayios Theodoros and Kophinou. There were designed to aggravate the tension between the two communities and thus clear the way for the dual *Enosis* and for the "NATO-ization" of Cyprus, that is, the old Acheson and Lemnitzer plans.

Again, however, events did not follow the desired course. Relations between Greece and Turkey became more strained. When the imperialists saw that they had lost control of the situation and that there was a serious danger of a military conflict breaking out between the NATO members, Johnson hurriedly sent his personal envoy Vance to the capitals of the two countries and ordered the Athens junta to accept Turkey's demands. The junta

obediently complied, thereby once again showing that the Greek army is used not to defend national interests but against its own people.

The purpose of the Vance mission was to find a solution to the Cyprus issue that would suit U.S. imperialist and NATO interests. It will be recalled that besides the U.S.-dictated Greco-Turkish agreement, there was also the U.S. proposal to hold Greco-Turkish talks on the territory of a neutral country.

Vance tried to get the Cyprus government to accept the demands of the Turkish government—which were also those of the imperialists—to extend the competence of the UN armed forces on the island and to disband the National Guard. The Cyprus government, however, rightly rejected these demands and insisted that Cyprus's security be guaranteed, that the Turkish and Greek troops be withdrawn and that when this had been done it would consider the matter of disbanding the National Guard.

The purpose of the imperialists and the Ankara chauvinists is to undermine the Cyprus government and the "good services" of U Thant; they want a settlement outside the United Nations;; in other words they want to weaken and then virtually abolish Cyprus as a state and thereafter impose their will on our people. So long as these intrigues continue there is always the danger of Cyprus again being caught up in a tense situation.

Our people know that the issue can be settled peacefully, without foreign imperialist intervention and on the basis of the internationally recognized principles of democracy and self-determination. How-

ever, to date no progress has been made in this direction, for the imperialists are primarily concerned with turning Cyprus into their military base.

The measures taken by the Cyprus government have created favorable conditions for the people themselves to settle the issue. All that is needed is good will on the part of the Turkish Cypriot leaders. The government has abolished all restrictions, including those imposed on the free movement of Turkish Cypriots. It now rests with the Turkish leaders to do the same in the Turkish areas of the Republic. The barriers separating the Turkish Cypriots from the Greek Cypriots must be removed, for these only further the designs of the imperialists to enslave our island.

For the people there is but one solution: an independent integral, sovereign and demilitarized Cyprus, pursuing a policy of non-alignment, with the Turkish Cypriots' rights clearly defined and guaranteed.

It was this feasible solution that President Makarios proposed and which won him the support of more than 95 per cent of the Greek Cypriots in the recent general election. The elections showed that the people stand united, that they reject any decision that would dismember their country and put it in bondage to the imperialists, that they will not tolerate imperialist interference in any form.

The Cyprus government has submitted its proposals through the UN Secretary General. Our people insist that the issue be settled within the framework of the United Nations and, specifically, in the Security Council where the voting procedure provides certain safeguards against the imperialists imposing their decision. Using its right of veto the Soviet Union has in this way more than once come to our support.

The reason why the intrigues and subversive activities of the imperialists and their agents in Cyprus have foundered up to now is due first and foremost to the united resistance of the people and their government, and also to the powerful support of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The growing friendship, cooperation and mutual trust between Greek and Turkish Cypriots is a telling blow to the plans to partition the island, to aggravate tension and discord between the two communities. The Progressive Party of Cypriot Working People (AKEL), has repeatedly stressed in this connection that it is not the Turkish Cypriots who are the enemies of the Greek

Cypriots, but imperialism which is their common foe and which is responsible for the present abnormal situation, and that it is against this enemy that the Cypriots, both Greeks and Turks, should direct their hatred, should take a common stand.

It is the Greek and Turkish Cypriots, and they alone, who can, by creating a climate of friendship and mutual trust, help to settle the Cyprus issue.

The economic front has played a decisive role in the anti-imperialist, national liberation movement of our people, for upon its success depends the success of the resistance movement. The economy has successfully withstood the strains and stresses of the abnormal and critical situation created in the country and, the unfavorable situation notwithstanding, made headway and achieved a growth in the national income.

This was made possible, of course, by the development programs and budget appropriations for production and social needs, but even more so by the efforts of the working people.

Throughout these years the people and their organizations have displayed a high sense of responsibility and true patriotism, thereby winning the right to a greater share of the national income.

The devaluation of sterling and, consequently, of the Cypriot pound, has brought with it many problems. And clearly, the economically stronger sections of society must shoulder the main burden of the resultant difficulties.

Unity of the people is essential if the problems besetting the present phase of the liberation struggle, and those that will arise following this phase, are to be successfully tackled.

Cyprus would have been at the mercy of the imperialists if they had succeeded in causing a split and a collision between the Right and the Left forces. Our Party, AKEL, has prevented this from happening. It is steadfastly pursuing a policy of unity as the key to solving the many problems of the national-liberation movement.

Some well-meaning people sometimes say to us that we AKEL members insist too much on a policy of unity. But in view of the present conditions nobody can "insist too much" on unity. Either you support or you don't support unity — there is no middle course here. Our Party wants unity not for the sake of unity, but for the sake of Cyprus, for the sake of saving the island from the imperialists and their agents.

Of course, there are different forms of

unity. We do not claim that our is necessarily the best and that it cannot be improved upon and extended. The unity we have achieved is the result of many years of effort and experience, and we must treasure it as the apple of our eye.

Our policy in regard to unity is not a transient one. It is based on long-term perspectives, and these show that many difficult problems, many dangers still lie ahead. And as in the recent past, so too in the future, it is unity of the people that will save Cyprus. Consistently and unswervingly pursuing its policy of unity, our Party uses its democratic right constructively to criticize any actions which it thinks are detrimental to the interests of the people. Ours is a constructive, not a destructive policy, and we are deeply convinced that this policy meets the vital interests of the people.

NATO is the worst enemy of our people. It was NATO which, through the American Ball and the Britisher Sandys, threatened Cyprus in January 1964 and tried to pressure Makarios into agreeing to a NATO occupation of the island. It was NATO that supplied Turkey with planes and napalm which brought death and destruction to the island in August 1964. It was NATO that planned, through Acheson and Lemnitzer, the partition of Cyprus in the guise of *Enosis*. And it is NATO high-ranking officials who are responsible for the present situation in our country. As previously noted, it was President Johnson's personal envoy who dictated to the Athens junta Greece's recent agreement with Turkey and who tried, without success, to get the Cyprus government to accept Turkey's conditions.

NATO is still trying to instal itself in Cyprus, for it needs our island as a springboard for war against the Arab and other peoples who have won their independence. If this were to happen, Cyprus would find itself under the yoke of the reactionary imperialist forces and in danger of being completely destroyed.

The foreign policy of our Republic can under no circumstances be a NATO-dictated policy. This would be a disgrace and an insult to our people and to the memory of their sons who gave their lives that Cyprus might be free. The Republic's foreign policy can only be one of non-alignment, and this policy has the support of the overwhelming majority if not the entire people.

The socialist countries, and especially the Soviet Union, are rendering Cyprus every support. The Soviet Government's warnings have had a sobering effect on the potential aggressors. The Soviet Union has consistently supported the independence, territorial integrity, sovereignty and demilitarized status of the Republic. The Soviet Union fully supports a peaceful solution of the Cyprus issue and is doing everything to rule out aggression against the island.

The people want to see their country completely demilitarized, want to see it become a haven of peace and accord among nations, and not an imperialist military base. Unity of the people, coupled with the unity and solidarity of all anti-imperialist forces and with a consistent, unflagging struggle will help to ensure the complete independence, territorial integrity, sovereignty and demilitarization of the Republic of Cyprus, pursuing a policy of non-alignment and full rights for the Turkish Cypriots.

U.S. imperialism in Latin America

LONGINO BECERRA

I.

The class struggle in the countries of Latin America is becoming increasingly explosive. New sections of the exploited and oppressed are joining forces with the fighters for freedom, democracy and progress. The revolutionary vanguard of the continent, represented first and foremost by the Communist parties, is consolidating its ranks in the process of sharpening social clashes and is advancing towards the goals set in the concrete conditions of the respective countries. Our continent is experiencing a period of ferment and popular actions compelling not only classes and parties, but also individuals to adopt a definite attitude. The alternative posed by the present situation—to support the old or the new—calls for an explicit answer. The struggle reflects the diversity of the militant effort which is acquiring definite forms, depending on the country and the specific conditions in it (legal or illegal forms, parliamentary or extra-parliamentary struggle, armed struggle or peaceful). In short, the hour of the revolutionary awakening of the peoples of Latin America has struck.

This situation has not arisen overnight. As Lenin wrote, "There are no miracles in nature or history." It is clear that the revolutionary ferment we are presently witnessing on the continent in the most diverse forms is part of the great process of social reconstruction now taking place, and whose distinctive feature is the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale. The growing might of the socialist world and the enhanced prestige of the socialist system which is resolving man's fundamental problems, are everywhere destroying fetishism and opening new vistas

for the ideas of peace, democracy and social progress. The exploited and oppressed are feeling the attraction of the socialist countries. Under the impact of their impressive achievements ever broader sections of the population are siding with the revolutionary struggle. We can repeat with good reason Romain Rolland's words about the Bolsheviks: "To a decrepit humanity enveloped in a cold and desolate gloom filled with horrible nightmares, you bring the light of a new day. . . ."

The Cuban revolution, which took place in the course of this world revolutionary upsurge, is a concrete manifestation in Latin America of the change in the balance of world forces in favor of socialism, democracy and peace. Carried out only 90 miles from the citadel of American imperialism, this revolution is proof that contemporary history is no longer being made in the conditions of the undivided sway of capitalism. Thanks to the struggle of the Cuban people, to the solidarity of the world's most progressive forces, headed by the socialist countries, the heroic island is able to pursue its constructive effort at the very doorstep of the main enemy of the peoples. This, naturally, has brought home to the masses of Latin America the true value of the struggle being waged on the continent by its progressive organizations and people. The victory of one country in the fight against the United States, the leading imperialist power, formerly widely regarded as utopian, has become a reality.

With the triumph of the Cuban revolution the class struggle in Latin America—determined essentially by the internal processes—became more acute. The decisive measures taken by the revolutionary government of Cuba with respect to landed property and the enterprises belonging to

U.S. monopolies, exerted a tremendous influence on subsequent developments in the rest of the continent and reinforced the aspirations of our peoples for radical change. The Cuban example kindled the flames of struggle on the continent where the discontent of the masses—the object of imperialist plunder—is spreading. Clearly, Cuba's impact on Latin America is not to the liking of Washington, and the valiant island has, therefore, to contend with constant danger. The existence of revolutionary Cuba, its significance for the revolutionary movement in Latin America make it incumbent on revolutionaries all over the world to defend the Cuban revolution.

The upswing of the world revolutionary movement is making the imperialists desperate. Their defeats in different parts of the world make it pretty clear to them that their sphere of domination is steadily shrinking. Sensing their inevitable doom they are resorting to all kinds of brutal actions to intimidate the peoples and arrest their victorious advance. Threats, reprisals, even war—such are the means with which the exploiters are trying to perpetuate their vicious system. U.S. imperialism's actions against the people of Vietnam and other peoples of the world are a glaring example of the terrible crimes committed by the imperialists when the sources of plunder are at stake. But far from reversing the course of history, these actions are but adding to the growth of the progressive trends. The reactionary offensive mounted by the imperialists to prevent the peoples becoming the masters of their destiny is, therefore, objectively, in the present conditions, the outcome of their fear and desperation at the scope of the revolutionary struggle.

II.

In the light of this policy the American imperialists cannot afford to remain indifferent to the upsurge of the popular struggle on the continent. Accustomed to regarding our continent as their "backyard" from which they draw cheap raw materials and labor power, the U.S. imperialists are plotting to prevent the emergence of a new Cuba, as President Johnson put it. With \$11,400 million directly invested in the countries of the continent the monopolies will of course try to prevent by fire and sword the spread of the Latin-American national liberation movement, especially

considering that these investments yielded a gigantic profit of \$40,000 million between 1945 and 1961. In addition, the continent is pumped of its material wealth; it has to supply at least 20 different kinds of the raw materials needed to keep U.S. production going and to ensure the expansion of the aggressors. Thus, American industry obtains from the continent 99.5 per cent of its tin, 39 per cent of its iron, 44.1 per cent of its copper, and 60.6 per cent of its zinc requirements. To this should be added the vast quantities of agricultural raw materials purchased on our continent at very low prices.

U.S. policy in respect to the countries of Latin America has always been based on direct interference in their internal affairs, and on dictatorial regimes. The Monroe Doctrine, *America for the Americans*, interpreted as meaning that "Americans" are those who live north of the Rio Grande, has since 1823 served as the backbone of this interventionist policy.

It should be noted, however, that the nature of the actions taken to preserve the continent's economic and political status quo depends, apart from other factors, on the prevailing policy of the top U.S. government officials and on the adroitness displayed by the chief executive in the White House. The history of U.S.-Latin American relations therefore contains facts relating either to the practical application of the policy known in its time as the "big stick," or of the line known as the "good neighbor policy." Clearly the main purpose of both the one and the other was to prevent or delay changes which could in any way affect the monopoly control of the United States over the continent's riches. In complex political situations Washington has had to combine the two policies.

The second method prevailed in the general policy of the Kennedy administration. To a certain extent Kennedy was able to view the contemporary world objectively and to realize, consequently, that naked force would hardly yield results in our day and age. Therefore, instead of bayonets he hoped to solve the anti-historical mission of protecting imperialism's interests by means of a policy in which the false promise of "reform" played an important part. And so it came about that in March 1961 Latin America witnessed the birth of the neo-colonialist *Alliance for Progress* which for demagogic purposes exploited the aspirations of the Latin-American people to free themselves from the semi-feudal sur-

vivals retarding the development of their national economies and the internal cause of the misery on our continent — in some countries greater, in others less. But this maneuver, which showed Kennedy to be an astute politician, encountered the opposition of diehards in the Pentagon who considered this policy dangerous by analogy with the contagious example of Cuba. The concrete result of these differences was the application of both policies simultaneously: on the one hand, promises to carry out reforms and, on the other, engineering military coups. Thus, between January 1961 and November 1963 eight military coups* were staged against governments of representative democracy or regimes of bourgeois semi-legality. But since these actions sharply contrasted with the Alliance for Progress policy, President Kennedy, although he made concessions to the die-hard extremists, continued to follow a demagogic concept of "reforms" not only in Latin America, but in other parts of the world as well.

Developments in the years since Kennedy's assassination show that the principal instruments of state power in the United States have passed into the hands of fascist-like politicians for whom the best parliaments are those established with the help of tanks and guns. Latin America is a case in point. The features of diplomacy characteristic of Kennedy's administration have been replaced by crude military force, particularly in those areas of the continent most shaken by the mass struggle. The old methods of vandalism are being re-introduced on a wide scale and in somewhat different forms through a new doctrine, the reverse of the one known as the Kennedy doctrine. This new doctrine was elaborated by Thomas Mann, an associate of the CIA and notorious for his ultra-right activities when he was a diplomat in Mexico in 1961-1963. As Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, to which post he was appointed in December 1963, he expounded his "doctrine" at a secret meeting of U.S. ambassadors in Latin America, in March 1964. Stripped of its verbiage, the Mann doctrine confirmed the need for U.S. imperialism to use force to prevent the advance of the democratic movement in Latin America.

* Military coups took place in the following countries: El Salvador on January 25, 1961; Ecuador on November 7, 1961; Argentina on March 28, 1962; Peru on July 18, 1962; Guatemala on March 31, 1963; Ecuador on June 11, 1963; the Dominican Republic on September 25, 1963; Honduras on October 3, 1963.

Since U.S. imperialism could not ignore outright a political line which to some extent recognized the legal framework of "representative democracy," it did so immediately after the assassination of Kennedy. After the Mann doctrine was proclaimed events moved fast on the continent. Openly called the "hard line," this policy was first put to the test in Brazil in 1964. In August 1961 militarists in Brazil, acting on CIA orders, tried to seize power but had to retreat as a result of the solid mobilization of the masses. Machinations continued in 1962 and 1963, but again without result since President Kennedy preferred to achieve the same objectives not through a military coup but by reaching an agreement with Joao Goulart. However, on April 1, 1964, the supporters of the "big stick" achieved their basic aim: political power in Brazil was seized by the army. The Mann doctrine had passed its first test. The way was now clear for other, more brazen actions.

True, long before the Mann doctrine Washington had used the "big stick" in our countries. Thus, for example, on the pretext of "protecting U.S. interests in the Canal Zone" aggression was carried out against the people of Panama in January 1964. In the past when students and patriots belonging to different social strata held meetings and demonstrations, demanding the restoration of the country's sovereignty over that part of Panamanian territory controlled by the imperialists, the occupation troops never acted with such naked brutality against the people as they did in 1964. U.S. marines and their local allies opened fire on the people. The blood of Panamanians dyed the waters of the Canal making vivid its comparison to a "big gaping wound on the body of a small sister country . . ."

In April 1965 the people in the Dominican Republic rose against the military dictatorship installed after the ultra-reactionary coup which overthrew President Juan Bosch. The people sought to restore the liberal constitution of 1963 and continue the democratic process that had set in with the ending of the Trujillo dictatorship. The imperialists, however, thought otherwise. Washington, exasperated by the existence of socialist Cuba and the sweep of the popular movement on the continent, refused to accept the democratic victory of the Dominican people, and decided to interfere in their affairs as they had repeatedly done in the past. Some 40,000

American soldiers rapidly occupied this small country in the Caribbean and drowned in blood the people's aspirations to establish representative democracy. As a result, Kennedy's ideas of reform were buried, while the Mann doctrine was supplemented by the Johnson doctrine. President Johnson declared that his government had every right to prevent the emergence of another Cuba on the continent. A month later, in September 1965, the U.S. House of Representatives adopted resolution No. 560, ratifying the "right" of the United States to use its armed forces in any country of the Western Hemisphere to prevent "subversive" activity. In this way the Alliance for Progress, as the program of an essentially neo-colonialist policy in Latin America, was completely discarded and replaced by the "big stick," cleaned of the layers of dust that had accumulated on it over the years.

III.

However, a return to the old positions-of-strength policy is not so easy in the conditions of today. In the past, U.S. imperialism could commit its crimes against the Latin-American peoples relatively easily: all it had to do was send its warships to the shores of any one of the countries, or have its marines land in the area of conflict. Today the situation has changed. A return to the "big stick" requires a military and semi-military program containing a wide range of alternatives that could be used against our peoples. The determination of the Latin-American people to fight compels Washington to resort to all kinds of means to make its policy effective. A study of the imperialists' actions in our countries that shows the preliminary structure that has been set up, employing all kinds of methods and technical means, is designed to achieve the aforementioned strategic aim. This of course only further complicates matters. *The alarming development of militarism, the establishment of supra-national institutions, the spread of ultra-reactionary organizations, of the espionage system, direct control of the organs of repression, the constant perfecting of technical means to control the people — such are some of the elements of the widespread net of restraint the U.S. imperialists have cast over Latin America.* Although some of these means existed before the current political line of the United States, they have now become the backbone of its

strategic line against our peoples.

The swift militarization of most Latin-American countries is obvious. Under the influence of the Pentagon, the armies of the continent are growing in disproportion to the material capacities of the countries concerned. The purpose of this unwarranted excessive expansion of the Latin-American armed forces is to eventually convert them into a dominant factor which, in addition to acting as a permanent occupation force in the service of foreign interests, will also control national policy. The systematic implementation of this policy has made for increasing interference by the military in recent years in political and government affairs. Even more. In Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Haiti the armed forces now hold all the reins of power and decide the main direction of state activity. On April 28, 1965, for example, Agence France-Press quoted the then Brazilian Defense Minister, Costa e Silva, as saying after a meeting of military leaders with the then President Castelo Branco: "Any candidate in the 1966 gubernatorial or presidential elections will be officially recognized only with the approval of the armed forces." A U.S. Senate report published in October 1967 classified our countries as follows: *with naked military dictatorships* — Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Haiti, Nicaragua, Paraguay, El Salvador and Honduras; *with civilian regimes behind which stand the military*: Peru, Venezuela, Ecuador, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic; *with governments in which the army does not play a leading political role*: Mexico, Costa Rica, Uruguay, Panama, Colombia and Chile. Although this classification is by no means exact, it bears out in many respects what has been said earlier.

But there are also other important aspects of this process. The Latin-American armies, for example, constitute a force of approximately 800,000 men, excluding the so-called security service. According to a report circulated in January 1968 by the U.S. Disarmament and Arms Control Agency, \$1,731 million, or approximately 13 per cent of the national budgets, were spent in 1965 on the continent's armed forces. The same report noted that in that same year Latin America used 2.1 per cent of the gross national product for military needs (arms purchases and the upkeep of the armies), which means that, taking into account the Economic Commission for Latin America data regarding the gross national product for the entire continent,

actual expenditures in 1965 reached the vast sum of more than \$2,000 million.

The United States has a special budget for its military program in the Latin-American armed forces. The journal *Vision*, organ of imperialist propaganda in Latin America, reported in April 1965 that between 1952 and 1964 the United States had earmarked \$800 million for military programs in the Latin-American republics. This money is spent on the upkeep of "special" missions operating in all the countries (with the exception of Cuba and Mexico) and which maintain absolute control over the activity of the armies. According to the *Washington Post*, the United States has special troops in 17 Latin-American countries. When journalists asked a White House top official about this he refused to confirm the figure, but admitted the presence of "green berets" in Panama, Bolivia, Venezuela, Colombia and Guatemala, adding that the numerical composition of these troops was a "military secret."

The Latin-American armies are equipped with arms sold to our countries under plans drawn up in Washington. A large part of this military equipment consists of World War II weapons. Modern arms go mainly to the so-called tactical units organized in all the armies of the continent to suppress popular movements. The argument advanced by the American imperialists in support of their policy of military aid is that it is the responsibility of the Latin-American armies to cover the internal front since a war between the countries of the continent is excluded. The United States will prevent this from happening, and if it does will regard it as its own war. Hence all deliveries of military materials are essentially intended for suppression of the popular struggle. For example, David Lindsay, President of the Covalier Aircraft Corporation, declared on February 8, 1968 that in view of the considerable guerrilla activity in Guatemala, and because of the El Salvador government's concern about the possible spread of such activity, he had been given permission by the State Department to sell the El Salvador government a number of 51-C jet fighters. Whenever a Latin-American country wants to purchase military equipment in Europe, thus deviating from the "internal front" principle, Washington resorts to all kinds of maneuvers to prevent such purchases. In November 1967 even such an ultra-reactionary as Carlos Lacerda declared that Washington was exerting pressure to prevent Brazil obtaining

15 supersonic "Mirage" planes in France. What better proof than Lacerda's statement of Washington's policy in these matters!

The United States is also supervising the training of officers for the Latin-American armies. In 1962 an "Inter-American Defense College" was opened at the Fort McNair military base to train officers ranking from colonel and higher. After the Cuban revolution special schools were opened in the United States and also in some Latin-American countries to train anti-guerrilla units. Large numbers of officers have been trained in the Caribbean school at Fort Gullick in the Panama Canal zone. The instructors are Fort Bragg graduates or veterans of the Vietnam war. There is also a special school at Fort Davis in the Canal Zone for training police agents for operations in the revolutionary movement and an Academy of the Inter-American Air Forces where army pilots are instructed in the latest methods of mass destruction. Graduates of these schools receive a special diploma which places them in a privileged position in their units. Needless to say, their training is essentially oriented on the so-called fight "against communism," the driving force of which is hatred for everything associated with freedom and democracy.

One of the objectives of imperialism at present is to coordinate as much as possible the repressive activity of these special troops so as to be able to employ multinational units against a definite country of the continent. Since this objective runs counter to the Latin-American political tradition of sovereignty and the right of nations to self-determination, the Hawks in the Pentagon are expounding the "theory" that today the concept of independence is being replaced by the concept of *interdependence* and that, accordingly, only ideological and not geographical frontiers are recognized. They urge pooling economic, political and military resources for a common goal, which is, firstly, to protect the interests of the imperialists and, secondly—since it is a question of the governments belonging to "one ideological community," to quote Johnson—to justify the dispatch of the troops of one country to another to bolster the pro-American oligarchies which are in danger of being overthrown by the people.

This global concept is materialized in a series of economic and military supranational bodies and what might be de-

scribed as an integrated system of repression. The Inter-American Defense Council, established in 1942, the Central American Defense Council established in December 1962, the Inter-American Peace Force, the creation of which is encountering difficulties—these are the organizational embodiment of Washington's efforts to put through its policy.

Formation of the Inter-American Peace Force is the No. 1 priority. Using an organization of this kind against the peoples of the continent, so Washington reckons, is less likely to compromise its political interests than a direct landing of American troops in one or another area of Latin America. Furthermore, such an organization offers more possibilities for maneuvering. The Pentagon strategists say *let Latin-Americans fight Latin-Americans* and, anticipating the advantages of the prospect, they seek a solution, within the framework of the OAS, that would enable them to create a continental army, and they persist in this despite repeated failures. In view of these very obvious defeats, Washington has elaborated new tactics and is applying them with utmost zeal. These tactics are to create regional "gorilla" blocs as a step towards forming a supra-national armed force. The U.S. government has secured agreements between the military regimes of Brazil, Argentina and Paraguay. A similar plan is being put into effect in the countries of Central America ruled by military regimes similar to the Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua. In January it was reported that the Central American Defense Council had decided to form a combined army to fight the guerrilla detachments in Guatemala. Somoza is an active spokesman for this plan.

The arsenal of this police policy which aims at unleashing reprisals against popular movements, includes a more despicable means to which U.S. imperialists resort in their drive to retard the revolution in our countries. We have in mind the systematic support of gangs set up with the express purpose of assassinating democratic leaders. Operating under the protection of dictatorial regimes, killers are active in many countries, ready to be used at crucial moments of the class struggle. An idea of their actions is provided by the record of terror in Guatemala by such organizations as NOA (New Anti-Communist Organization), MANO (Authentic National Organized Movement) and CADEG (Anti-Communist Council of Guatemala). A statement issued

by the Guatemalan Party of Labor in March says: "More than 3,000 have been murdered since the Mendez Montenegro regime took over. The victims come from diverse social and age groups. The wave of terror continues to take a heavy toll of revolutionary patriots." Reports in the Guatemalan and world press say that these fascist-type gangs are trained by CIA instructors and cooperate closely with the security service.

Obviously these activities, ranging from outright aggression to assassination, necessitate a ramified intelligence service. And since U.S. imperialism is prepared to go to any length and stoop to any methods in suppressing the peoples, it has not hesitated to set up and direct such a service and, it should be said, not without success. All U.S. diplomatic missions in Latin-America run "technical aid" offices which serve as a cover for the CIA and its far-flung espionage operations. Members of the Peace Corps likewise provide information for the U.S. secret service. There are more than 4,500 U.S. agents of this type operating in our countries. And last, but not least, mention should be made of a less blatant intervention project, the celebrated "sociological studies." Their purpose is to exploit Latin-American universities for gathering strategic intelligence that might facilitate repressions in one or other country. The best known of these projects, and one that aroused worldwide protests, was the Camelot Plan, which the Americans tried to put through in Chile in 1965.

Economic integration is to provide the material basis for this superstructure. And integration is being carried out at a continental level under U.S. sponsorship and protection. The Punta del Este summit statement says: "The Presidents of the Latin-American republics have agreed, beginning with 1970, gradually to create a Latin-American common market to begin functioning, in the main, within 15 years." This was followed by the bland statement that "the President of the United States of America pledges full support for this promising Latin-American initiative." That pledge goes beyond U.S. cooperation in operating the plan. What we have is an open invitation to the North American monopolies to share in the project. And this is already being done in the Central-American Common Market. This and the Latin-American Free Trade Association are the foundation of the plan drawn up at Punta del Este. It will therefore be reason-

able to predict that the results will be as indicated above. Mexico's Foreign Minister, Antonio Carrillo Flores, stated last July that though the Punta del Este statement emphasized the "Latin-American" nature of the common market, this is unacceptable "if its sole purpose is to open the floodgates to big foreign concerns." This is indicative of the concern felt, but is not a true reflection of reality. For the Latin-American common market — and this is confirmed by all experience — is expressive of U.S. imperialism's design to impose its economic control on the continent, and to retain—with all the advantage offered by integration—the present economic pattern of our countries as appendages to the U.S. imperialist economy.

IV.

This survey leads to the conclusion that the struggle is against an enemy prepared to employ the most dastardly methods to prevent the victory of the Latin-American peoples. Difficult battles are ahead for our continent. And the duty and responsibility of everyone fighting for economic and political independence is correctly to appraise the enemy's strength, not to underestimate his ability to resist, nor to overestimate his ability to reverse the tide of history. As we advance towards our goal we must always be able realistically to assess the developments, something the imperialists cannot do because they are doomed by history. A correct and realistic assessment of the situation is, then, the earnest of fresh success on every sector of the front and provides a firm basis for final victory. "Experience," Comrade Brezhnev said in his address on the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, "shows that to defeat such a strong and perfidious enemy as imperialism, we must oppose to him, besides firmness and self-sacrificing readiness to fight, sober political analysis, coolness and tenacity." That is fully confirmed by recent experience in Latin America and it must be taken into account in assessing

present and future revolutionary opportunities.

The fight against the U.S. imperialist machinery of repression requires mobilization and deployment of all the popular forces. Defeated on other fronts, notably in Vietnam, the aggressors are preparing, and already carrying out, preventive measures in all parts of Latin America. They are using the most barbarous means in an attempt to crush the popular movements. Hence, unity of the anti-imperialist forces on a national and continental scale is today a vital need. Isolated forces are an easy prey for the enemy, and the enemy knows that. That is why he is working so methodically to split the ranks of the popular vanguard. We in Latin-America know from experience that imperialism is quick to exploit every opportunity offered by those who sow disunity. Marx wrote: "An army in which the soldiers quarrel less will defeat its adversary." This is all the more valid today in the hard-fought revolutionary battles now unfolding in Latin America.

And Latin America will not be led into the morass of defeatism, whatever imperialist propaganda may say or do. The masses are fighting for their economic and political demands. The U.S. government, no matter what method it employs, cannot stop the revolutionary ferment in Latin America. The exploiters and freebooters want to bully our people into compliance so as to make it all the easier to drain the life-blood of our countries. But that is a dream. It will never be a reality, for as the imperialists multiply their crimes and escalate their wars, whether in Latin America or in other parts of the world, the forces facing them will grow, and the battle for the rights and interests of the people will grow in intensity. The process is inexorable; it is present in every contest between those who want the triumph of the new and those who want to perpetuate the old. And in these battles the masses are being steeled; from them they draw inspiration and faith in the final triumph of their cause.

The Delhi conference and the third world

Although the second United Nations Conference for Trade and Development (UNCTAD-2), which ended in New Delhi at the close of March, was attended by nearly 2,000 delegates from 130 countries and 44 international organizations, it was not as representative as it could have been by reason of the discrimination against the German Democratic Republic, the People's Republic of China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

Like the first conference, UNCTAD-2 dealt with a narrower set of questions than its title suggests, its agenda being confined to the problems of backwardness and the question of international economic ties in the world today.

* * *

As was the case four years ago in Geneva, the voice of the Third World resounded strongly at the New Delhi conference, which may be credited with having thoroughly examined the question of imperialist exploitation of economically underdeveloped countries, showing that so long as the spontaneous laws of the world capitalist market persist, exploitation will tend to increase.

The developing countries demanded, with the backing of the socialist states, that the imperialist powers follow a policy dampening, rather than intensifying the exploitative course of the monopolies, compelling the imperialist countries to accede in words to a number of demands.

This gave wing to certain illusions in the big family of the developing states. Yet it will be recalled that after UNCTAD-1 they decided on forming Group of 77 to coordinate efforts in the belief that since justice was on their side they could by persuasion obtain at least a partial compensation for the imperialist plunder per-

petrated against the poorest of the world's nations. But the facts belied their hopes.

Last October, meeting in Algiers, the Group of 77 reviewed the fulfilment of the UNCTAD-1 resolutions and worked out a common policy for UNCTAD-2. It turned out that there was nothing tangible to review, for fulfilment of the resolutions was practically nil. That this is no exaggeration is borne out by the opening part of the summing-up document, the *Algiers Charter*, which notes that the condition of the more than 1,000 million people in the developing countries is continuing to deteriorate due to the prevailing trends in international economic relations.

Economic growth rates in the Third World countries are falling steadily, the gap between them and the growth rates of the developed states grows wider. Between 1955 and 1960 the gross national per capita product of the backward countries rose annually by 2.2 per cent and that in the developed capitalist countries 2 per cent, while in the next five years (1960-65) economic growth in the Third World countries was 2 per cent a year and that in the imperialist states 3.6 per cent, with the respective figures for 1965-1966 being 1.5 and 3.9 per cent. In absolute figures, the per capita income in the developed countries is rising by an average \$60 a year, while the rise in the backward countries averages barely \$2.

This is chiefly due to a lag in Third World exports, which inevitably affects purchasing power. The Third World's share in world exports shrank from 27 per cent in 1953 to 19.3 per cent in 1966, with export prices for food and raw materials falling and the developing countries receiving \$2,500 million less annually.

This complicates the problem of foreign debts, which increased from \$10,000 million in 1955 to \$40,000 million in 1966. But

whereas the aggregate debt increased four-fold, settlements (payment of interest and repayment) increased eightfold (rising from \$500 million to \$4,000 million) and are likely to swallow all inflowing foreign exchange up to and including 1970.

Furthermore, stagnation in food production, which due to the rapid growth of the population is adding to the hardships of the people, has compelled imports of more food, reducing the capacity for acquiring means of production and, therefore, impeding further economic growth.

In spite of this highly alarming state of affairs, they have done nothing of what they had solemnly promised to do in the concluding UNCTAD-1 document.

No new agreements reflecting the interests of the backward countries were concluded on deliveries of manufactured goods and raw materials;

—far from reducing their protectionist regulations in relation to agricultural products competing with Third World exports, the imperialist countries have raised the barriers higher;

—while purchasing prices of raw materials imported from backward countries declined seven per cent since 1958, the prices of raw materials exported by the capitalist states increased 10 per cent;

—manufacture of synthetic materials, customs barriers, quota restrictions and taxation of products imported from underdeveloped countries combine to cause considerable damage to Third World exports;

—tariff discrimination against the economically backward countries has increased by reason of the integration of capitalist states and the custom rebates accorded in the Kennedy round;

—last but not least, fulfilment of the commitment assumed by the developed capitalist countries to make available one per cent of their national income for the benefit of the developing countries is at a far lower mark than before, dropping from 0.87 per cent in 1961 to 0.62 per cent in 1966.

Another factor with an adverse effect is that the terms of inter-state financing are hardening: state loans are shrinking, interest rates are going up, dates of repayment are shorter, and the provision that credits are spendable solely in the giving country is enforced more rigidly.

After spelling out these points, the Group of 77 finalized the aims it would pursue at the New Delhi conference in more specific terms, concentrating on tasks that appear-

ed feasible. The motto was: "From general to specific acts, from word to deed".

* * *

The conference showed that the situation is marked by grave difficulties. Charles Smith, *Financial Times* correspondent, observed that "the most important single result" of the conference was "the disillusion which was generated as to the possibility of any fruitful debate between the developed and developing nations on ways to solve the latter's problems." Mind you, when Smith writes of "developed nations," omitting the adjective "capitalist," he overlooks the fact that his formula does not apply to the relationship between the economically underdeveloped and socialist countries.

The United States, seconded in nearly all matters by Britain, went out of its way to reduce to nought the results of the conference, and their influence in the capitalist camp being considerable, their attitude was all but decisive.

Both countries made it clear that they were reluctant to assume any far-reaching commitment concerning financial "aid," and amplified the recommendation of the closing session concerning the one per cent of their national income being turned over for the needs of backward countries with a clause exempting countries suffering economic or balance of payments difficulties. By way of "compensation," the U.S. delegation, which was prominent among the other delegations from the developed capitalist states, did its utmost to "sell" the developing countries the discredited "commodity" of private foreign investments.

Ever faithful to the U.S. line, West Germany advocated a "free" (monopoly-capitalist) formation of prices on the world market, opposing all regulation projects designed to inhibit the pernicious effect of price fluctuations on backward economies.

However, despite the dearth of concrete results, UNCTAD-2 was not a total defeat for the relations of the Third World countries with the imperialist world. In that respect, the ill-intentioned commentaries of finance-sponsored periodicals, especially about UNCTAD "bureaucratism" and the "Doctor Prebisch theory," are evidence of the dismay reigning among the imperialists over the consolidation of UNCTAD, now the rostrum for all the developing countries and a vehicle promoting their mutual understanding with the socialist countries in the fight against the economic policy of the imperialists and their apologists.

* * *

The economic relations between developing and socialist countries are on an entirely different plane, and not least of all because the two groups of nations have many interests in common. Efforts to secure independent growth without monopoly-capital interference, to combat discrimination in international trade, to quash the autarchic tendencies of regional capitalist blocs, to reduce military expenditure and use the released funds for the benefit of the Third World countries, to establish new principles of the international division of labor — those are but a few of the coinciding aims most strongly in evidence with respect to those developing countries striving to build up a truly independent economy.

The disparities, meanwhile, are non-antagonistic and mostly concern objective difficulties stemming from the limited free material resources and import possibilities of the socialist countries, and, lastly, from deficiencies of an organizational and technical nature.

The difference between the socialist and imperialist worlds was never more distinct than at UNCTAD-2. The socialist states supported the developing countries in their confrontation with the imperialist bloc not only by their critical stand, but by advancing constructive proposals and, in many cases, setting the example. This was true, among others, of the negotiations regulating the agricultural products market by agreements.

On March 26 the conference adopted a ten-point resolution, reflecting the positive stand of the socialist countries in respect to many of the wishes of the economically underdeveloped states, namely:

- increasing the volume of trade, especially imports of raw materials, manufactured and semi-finished products;

- concluding long-term agreements for raw materials in order to stabilize prices and the volume of trade;

- allowing the developing countries to use active commercial balances in socialist countries for buying goods in other socialist countries;

- repealing customs tariffs on manufactured goods and semi-finished products (such tariffs having been repealed for raw materials by some countries shortly after UNCTAD 1);

- all other terms being equal, giving preference to imports from developing countries;

- avoiding re-export of goods purchased from developing countries;

- selling machinery and equipment against credits payable in commodities produced by the developing countries;

- promoting technical research in the developing countries and informing them of the results of research in the socialist states.

The *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* observed that the developing countries have every reason to consider this resolution the most important of the conference.

The resolution on East-West trade was another considerable achievement, though some of the developing countries feared that greater trade between the socialist camp and the developed capitalist states could be damaging to them. However, the debate and the above-named resolution convinced them of the contrary, showing that greater East-West trade would increase the flow of foreign exchange into the socialist countries, enabling them to expand purchases in the Third World. Normalization and more trade with the socialist countries, once demanded only by the most advanced in the non-socialist world, are now internationally recognized aims, and for that, too, much of the credit goes to UNCTAD-2.

As the socialist countries see it, UNCTAD is the most representative international trade-promotion body in existence and, consequently, the most competent intermediary between the various groups and sub-groups of countries. Hence the support and aid they extend to it.

* * *

It may be in order here to draw a few conclusions, summing up UNCTAD-2:

1. To secure a new international trading policy and a new type of international division of labor facilitating the growth of the developing countries, discussions should proceed at government level. However, such contacts alone are insufficient to conquer backwardness. The methods of combating the international monopolies and exerting pressure on imperialist states must be varied. More substantial concessions could probably be wrested from them by rallying public opinion in the developed capitalist states in support of the democratic alternative to the present neo-colonialist economic relations with the Third World, and through participation of the peoples of the region in the fight against backwardness. Hence, not only the ruling

element but the public as a whole should deal with the problems of trade and development.

2. It is clear that imperialism will make no essential concessions until it is convinced that its policy geared to inhibiting the socio-economic growth of the nations it had oppressed for years, may cause a reaction imperilling its privileges. Possibly, the failure of the aggressive imperialist policy in Vietnam, and its economic consequences for the capitalist world, will hammer home a few facts of life to the bourgeois rulers. More vigorous use by the developing countries of all the means they possess to curtail monopoly domination and coordinate the anti-monopoly struggle could be an important avenue of pressure.

3. The developing countries must carry through an internal structural reconstruction, notably to work for a more rapid growth of agriculture in order to combat food shortages, determine and improve use of their resources for industrialization.

It will take revolutionary effort by the peoples for complete liberation from the political and economic oppression of the imperialists and their abettors in the young states to achieve these aims. For this revolutionary effort to succeed, mutual understanding and cooperation are essential between the developing countries, on the one hand, and the socialist camp, the international working class and the Communist movement, on the other.

Francisco MIERES

France: towards unity of the Left

FRANCOIS BILLOUX

The joint Statement adopted on February 24, 1968 by the French Communist Party and the Federation of the Democratic and Socialist Left is one more step towards uniting the Left forces.

It was received with satisfaction by the people, and with unconcealed fury by the Gaullist upper crust and the reactionaries: they had all along banked on division of the democratic and labor forces. The supporters of one-man rule now bitterly admit that, notwithstanding all their efforts, they have lost the trump which in May 1958, in the situation created by the coup in Algeria, enabled them to capture power.

Their disappointment is understandable. The document signed on February 24 is not an action program of a democratic government, but, then, neither is it simply a reiteration of the agreement concluded December 20, 1966.

On three main issues—defense of freedom and democratic institutions, economic and social issues, and foreign policy—there is a much closer identity of views and a much firmer tone. There are, of course, differences, and they have been clearly set out by each side.

The reactionaries can no longer affirm that the Left forces can agree only on election campaigns. For what we now have is a minimum program for joint action which, in its substance, clearly demonstrates to the workers and other democrats that elaboration of a common Left government program is not only necessary, but possible.

What are the focal points of united action today? The answer will be found in the analysis of the joint Statement made

by the Communist Party at its plenary meeting on February 24.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS AND DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

Both sides reaffirmed their opposition to the regime of personal rule "in any shape or form." They had no difficulty in agreeing on the need for joint effort to replace it by a genuine democracy that would give every citizen a share in political life and in the activities of central and local government institutions.

As was to be expected, constitutional problems were the subject of much controversy. It will be recalled that in 1958 the Communist Party vigorously campaigned against the Gaullist Constitution, but the Socialists and Radical Socialists (who shared in its framing) campaigned for an affirmative vote in the referendum.

Now as then, the Communist Party maintains that the Constitution is heavily weighted in favor of Big Business. However, it did not adopt an "all-or-nothing" attitude in the negotiations. It insisted on removal, or at least alteration, of the constitutional provisions on which the one-man regime is based, and this was incorporated into the statement — a definite achievement.

There are differences also over the electoral law.

The Federation sees no need to change the existing law, though the last elections showed up its injustice. While the Gaullists and Independents (Giscard d'Estaing) polled a bare 38 per cent of the vote they have not less than half of the seats in the National Assembly whereas the Commu-

nists, with five million votes, have only 72 seats; under a proportional-representation system, they would have had 105. The Party regards proportional representation as an effective means of promoting democracy and suggests that it be applied in all elections in order to foil—in the words of the joint Statement—“all attempts to prevent a Left government from carrying out its program” and put an early end to an unjust electoral system which, moreover, the present government intends to make more unjust still.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Measures by the monopoly government directly affecting living standards have aroused more resentment and condemnation than any other aspect of its policy. This explains why, both in the joint Statement and in the agreement of December 20, 1966, the closest approximation of positions is on social and economic matters.

Both sides condemned de Gaulle's anti-social policy and formulated a series of concrete proposals for economic development, increased purchasing power, higher wages, pensions and other benefits, full employment, a better social insurance scheme, improved educational and vocational training facilities, scientific research, agricultural development, housing construction, etc. This provides a broad base for joint action and is of first-rate importance.

Differences in this area concern problems relating to the extension of democracy and defense of labor's interests. The Communist Party suggests a national minimum wage of 60,000 old francs a month. To this the Federation objects: “The consequences of such a decision, its impact on the general wage structure, could be fully assessed only if the Left were in power.”

The Federation makes the same reservation on the widespread demand for tax reform. In common with the Communists, it wants a higher tax-exempt maximum (income tax is a heavy burden on wage and salary workers), but has refrained from naming any specific figure; the Communist Party proposes that incomes up to 500,000 old francs be exempt from income tax. Following the example of Federal Germany, the French government has this year extended the so-called added-cost tax to trade, the handicrafts and agriculture. The Communist Party is resolutely opposed to this extension of indirect taxation, which will mean both higher prices and more depen-

dence of local government on the central authorities, since the indirect tax replaces local (communal) taxes. The Federation, on the other hand, is critical only of the way the measure is operated, it does not object to the new tax as such.

Other differences concern nationalization or, rather, its scale. The Federation wants to confine it to the commercial banks, the armaments and cosmetics industries.

The Communist Party, on the other hand, believes that “comprehensive public control of the credit system is inconceivable without nationalization of the main commercial and deposit banks and the big insurance companies; otherwise there will always be the danger of the monopolies retaining their positions. The Party believes that nationalization should be consistently extended to include key industries (electronics, aircraft and air transport, oil and nuclear energy, chemicals, iron and steel, and automobiles), which are the very mainstay of monopoly power, the basic source of our national wealth and which play a decisive part in our national life. Besides, we must take into account the Malthusian character of monopoly domination, the rapid growth of foreign control, and the increase in state subsidies.”

Waldeck Rochet told the Central Committee meeting: “Only structural reforms of this type will give a popular-supported government of democratic unity the necessary means to carry out a policy of social and cultural progress in the interests of the people and, at the same time, open the road to socialism. As Communists we believe that in the event of victory the Left parties should join the government to implement a democratic program envisaging progressive social measures and conforming to the wishes of the working population, not a Big Business program, as Harold Wilson is doing in England. This would create favorable conditions for the advance to socialism.”

And so, an analysis of the first two sections of the Statement will show that it does not contain all the provisions of the Communist home policy program. But every point in it contributes to an effective and really democratic program. The positions of the Federation and of the Communist Party (which always substantiates its views) are set out in a way that enables every worker and every democrat to judge what path should be followed and define his own place in the struggle.

FOREIGN POLICY

Much the same applies to the third, foreign-policy section, where there is a wide margin of difference. It should be observed that the popular demands on foreign-policy matters do not exert the same direct and strong influence on the leaders of the non-Communist Left as do domestic issues—living standards, working conditions, democratic freedoms, etc. But, significantly, since the December 1966 agreement new points of convergence have crystallized, or are in the process of crystallization.

For example, both sides advocate renunciation of the nuclear striking force, French accession to the nuclear test-ban treaty, armaments reduction, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, atom-free zones in Europe, a European collective security system, of which recognition of the Oder-Neisse boundary should be the initial element.

The two sides also agree on cooperation with, and genuine assistance to—free of all vestiges of colonialism — ex-colonial countries.

On Vietnam, agreement was reached on the following three points: immediate and unconditional cessation of the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam; an early political settlement based on application of the Geneva principles, which envisage the right of the Vietnamese people themselves to decide their future; recognition of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

The two sides do not see eye to eye on the causes of the Vietnam war. Most Federation leaders are inclined to blame both belligerents, whereas the Communist Party believes that the blame lies squarely with the United States, which violated the UN Charter and the 1954 Geneva Agreements, invaded Vietnam and started the war. Accordingly, the Communists demand a complete American withdrawal from South Vietnam, normal relations with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and recognition of the National Liberation Front as the sole genuine representative of the South Vietnam population.

On the Middle East issue there was agreement on these points: a general political settlement; peace based on recognition of Israel's right to exist and respect for the rights of the Arab states in conformity with the Security Council resolution, which emphasizes "the inadmissibility of territorial acquisition by armed force"; peace terms that would guarantee the inviolability of boundaries, the position of the Palestine

refugees, and use of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

However, these principles are, in effect, repudiated by Federation leaders. In their view, stable peace requires not only recognition of Israel, but also consolidation of her final boundary; they do not accept the 1948 cease-fire line as the permanent peace frontier.

Both sides reaffirmed their condemnation of the dictatorial regimes in Spain, Portugal and Greece, and their determination to continue joint efforts for solidarity with the people of these countries.

They note that the Common Market, which has become a real factor of international life, is dominated by cartels, trusts and international pressure groups. This must be changed to give the Common Market a new economic and social orientation corresponding with the interests of the working people. Trade unions, workers and farmers organizations, and also all political parties represented in the national parliaments, must be allowed representation and effective rights in Common Market bodies.

Here, too, we have a broad base for joint action.

NATO

But differences persist on two cardinal foreign-policy issues: France's attitude towards military blocs led by U.S. imperialism, and towards the so-called European system, at the head of which stands the world's second imperialist power, revanchist Bonn Germany.

This is the Federation's view: "Pending a new world situation, France's unilateral withdrawal from existing alliances, particularly the Atlantic community, would be dangerous." This can only mean that the Federation favors French integration in a military bloc which—whether they like it or not—is subject to the decisions and interests of American Big Business. The Federation's program of July 14, 1966 leaves no doubt on that score: "The Atlantic alliance should be reorganized in the interests of unity, and the limits and implications of the military agreements binding its members should be precisely defined."

The Communist Party, in contrast, argues that France's interests require complete rejection of American tutelage and withdrawal from all military alliances. The Party restated its position in the document approved on February 24: "The French

Communist Party, which rejects both national isolation and national self-negation, regards national independence as fundamental to a democratic foreign policy. Our national security requires that France be fully sovereign in shaping her destiny."

While supporting the principle of international mediation to preserve peace, the Party believes that it should be applied in strict conformity with the United Nations Charter.

The Party further states: "The French Communist Party is against renewal of the Atlantic Pact after its expiry in 1969 and urges France's withdrawal from NATO by that date. We must not permit a situation in which France, by virtue of her membership in the U.S.-dominated Atlantic community, could be dragooned into a war fought in the interests of American imperialism, whose aggressive policy and claim to police the world offer an increasing and very real menace to independence and peace. Pending the simultaneous dissolution of military blocs, towards which all our efforts should be directed, France's national interest lies in steering clear of blocs. That would give her complete freedom of initiative and an active part in efforts for collective security and international cooperation, notably with all European countries without exception."

EUROPE AND THE COMMON MARKET

The Federation leaders favor a political Common Market alliance, later to be joined by other nations, under a supranational authority. It would, of course, be dominated by West Germany and would assume powers now exercised by national parliaments and governments, so that, in the end, this supranational body could decide France's future without—indeed against—the consent of her representatives.

The scheme would only serve the hegemonic proclivities of German imperialism, the substance of which has been blandly set out by Franz Josef Strauss, Defense Minister under Adenauer and Finance Minister in the present Kiesinger government, in his book *Project for Europe*. Herr Strauss starts out with the statement that "reunification of Germany" on terms advantageous to Bonn can be achieved only in the context of a "united" capitalist Europe. Strauss amplifies: "In the next few years we must concentrate on political unity of the Six and bring Britain and other European countries into the Common Market.

At the same time, however, we should lay the foundations for a six-nation European deterrent force, to which the British nuclear potential will subsequently be added. The next goal will be a European federation which will gradually take over the sovereign rights of Europe's nations. Eventually, they will enjoy a status similar to that of the states (Laender) of Federal Germany."

Nor is that all. Strauss continues: "A united Western Europe would be the preparatory stage for a United States of Europe embracing all the nations of Central and Eastern Europe. The united Europe would thus become a nuclear power, alongside the USA and USSR and assure the superiority of the free (capitalist) society in the clash of world political forces."

This alone should make it perfectly clear that our Party's attitude, as explained in its comments on the February 24 agreement, fully conforms with the interests of France and the legitimate patriotism of her citizens and also with the cause of national independence and world peace.

"The French Communist Party stands for an independent, democratic and peaceable Europe built on the broad political and economic cooperation of all its countries.

"It believes that France should not confine herself to the narrow framework of a Little Europe of the Six or Seven, but should foster trade, economic and technical contacts with all European countries without discrimination.

"Nationalization of key branches of the economy in a democratic France would, apart from anything else, provide the conditions for fruitful cooperation with European countries. This would be a component element of French economic stability and progress."

A democratic policy within the Common Market, the Communist Party believes, should be a basic demand in any agreement with other Left parties. The Party categorically rejects the idea of a supranational authority, which, in practice, would be a tool of the most reactionary, aggressive and revanchist forces of European finance capital, of those who now hold sway in the German Federal Republic.

Our first concern, therefore, Waldeck Rochet told the Central Committee, is "to force the present West German leaders to respect Europe's postwar frontiers, accept the existence of the two German states, and renounce all claims to nuclear weapons in whatever form. That is a necessary starting point for moving ahead to a collec-

tive security system that would guarantee peace to all European nations, including the two German states."

FORWARD STEP

What is needed is for the non-Communist Left to take a more realistic view of the situation at home and abroad. On some questions, notably the attitude to the Gaullist regime, this has already been done.

In the 1958 general election campaign the Socialist Party acted as a "figurehead of the Fifth Republic," that is, the Gaullist regime. Ours was the only party to oppose that regime and the only party to wage a consistent and sustained struggle against the French bourgeoisie's war to strangle the Algerian independence movement. We alone built up the powerful movement which today is the only force capable of putting an end to the omnipotence of the monopolies and reaction—the alliance of the working class and the democratic elements aimed at giving France a system based on genuine progress and peace.

An analysis of the February 24 Statement will show that we have taken another step towards unity. And not only because there is a wider margin of agreement, but also because consistent operation of agreements and joint statements is bound, gradually, to remove the obstacles to an effective, common program.

In our day, genuine democracy is inconceivable without constitutional reform (especially the introduction of proportional representation at all elective levels), and without thoroughgoing economic changes (above all nationalization), upon which the Communist Party has always insisted. There can be no meaningful advance along the road to democracy, progress and peace without constant struggle against reaction and monopoly domination in home and foreign policy.

These are the conclusions that follow from a careful reading of the February 24 Statement as a whole.

It furnishes a new and more solid base in the struggle for the cause of the working class and democracy. And the best proof of that, perhaps, are the virulent attacks to which it has been subjected by the extreme reactionary faction, assisted by the so-called Centrists, those apostles of reaction and their witting and unwitting supporters on the Left.

Incidentally, this mobilization of all the reactionary forces has had the effect of

highlighting the importance of the Statement, emphasizing the Party's correct line in working for unity, and stripping the mask from the enemies of our people.

REACTION ON THE WAR PATH

The Gaullist leaders have never made any secret of their plans to exploit division on the Left in furtherance of their anti-social policies. One of their propaganda figments is that the Left parties and groups are "incapable" of drawing up a common government program. That was disproved by the joint candidature in the 1965 presidential election and the December 20, 1966 agreement, which signified a new stage in their work for a joint program.

Parliamentary and cantonal elections have revealed the growing influence of the Left and a steady loss of votes by the Gaullists and other reactionary parties.

To arrest that process, which could end in the abolition of one-man rule, Pompidou has sought to belittle the importance of the Statement and to present it in a distorted, caricature light.

In doing so he resorts to crude anti-communism. The Communist Party and the Federation have agreed "jointly to consider measures to foil attempts to prevent a Left government from carrying out its program." Pompidou uses that statement—deliberately torn out of its context—to wax indignant at the "totalitarian" measures of the extreme Left and hold up the old bogey of "Communist dictatorship." But, then, M. Pompidou is a former Director-General of the Rothschild Bank and now chief spokesman and representative of the Gaullist regime.

No doubt M. Pompidou and other Big-Business agents are furious because they fear the loss of their privileges if the Communists are given ministerial posts in a Left government. But they are grossly mistaken if they believe that their fear is shared by the millions of workers who are the first to suffer from the present government's reactionary policies.

The workers, and democrats generally, know that Communist ministers in a Left government are the best guarantee that their interests will be properly looked after. And the passage from the Statement which Pompidou probably thinks will scare the people, will be seen by the workers as an obligation that fully accords with their desire, namely, a clean break with the past.

The Gaullists and all the other reactionaries—Giscard D'Estaing, Lecanuet and Duhamel — trot out another argument, borrowed from an article by Roger Priouret in *L'Express*: "The economic and social policy set out in the February 24 agreement is unrealistic and reeks of demagoguery."

Truly a sight for the gods—the reactionaries and Gaullists shedding crocodile tears about the catastrophes likely to befall France in the event of her people electing a democratic government. But they have nothing to say about the hardships of the majority of the people, for which they are responsible. Nor are they willing to disclose what happens to the profits resulting from a 60 per cent rise in industrial output and a 50 percent rise in productivity over the past 10 years.

And there is also this pertinent question: who reaps the benefits from the technological advance? It is on these issues that the difference between Gaullist and truly democratic economic and social policies stands out in bold relief.

No one is likely to deny that higher production and productivity are partly due to technological progress, but they are also due—and to a no lesser degree—to stepped-up exploitation of the worker. In the opinion of the Gaullists and their reactionary friends, however, the fruits of the technological advance should accrue only to Big Business, not to society as a whole. They even assert that an industrial society breeds unemployment or semi-unemployment with all their attendant consequences. Actually, the hardship is due entirely to the fact that industrial development serves the interests of individuals, not the community.

When the reactionaries try to drive home the idea that the revenue envisaged in the February Statement will cover no more than 15 per cent of its envisaged expenditure, they proceed from the present state of affairs, but a democratic government would change all that.

Besides, no one has ever claimed that the measures listed in the February Statement will be carried out in a matter of weeks or months. Implementation of the joint government program will cover a whole period, and will take into account the rate of technological progress and higher productivity levels. The difference, however, will be that the results of technological progress will be shared by the whole of society and not merely by a privileged minority.

MINIMUM PROGRAM FOR A LEFT GOVERNMENT

The longer the Gaullist government remains in office, the longer it is allowed to pursue its anti-social policy in certain industries, public education, health, etc., the more difficult will it be to reverse, or even alter, this trend. This underscores the need to press the immediate wage and other social demands of the workers and, equally important, the need for united action to rid the country of this regime of social retrogression.

Besides, the February Statement does not include all the measures proposed by the Communists which, in our opinion, will have to be carried out by a government of the united Left. In this respect it is not yet a government program.

In some cases Federation policy and statements by its leaders play into the hands of the Gaullists. For instance, anxious to curry favor with the reactionaries parading under a Centrist label, they emphasize elements of their own program that contradict the February Statement, rather than the social and economic issues on which agreement has been reached.

This is not new; it is a carry-over from the past practices and tactics of the non-Communist Left, but it has a certain appeal because the democratic movement attracts elements still imbued with the spirit of bourgeois ideology.

However, despite the impediments, the Party's work over the past two years to build up mass support for a unity agreement has borne results.

In 1966 we arranged hundreds of meetings so that the workers could pass judgment on the proposals we wanted to put into the common program. On December 20, 1966 an agreement was concluded between the Communist Party and the Federation of the Democratic and Socialist Left. After the 1967 parliamentary elections we suggested that the Federation consider formulating a common program, and we continued to popularize the idea in the factories, residential areas and in the countryside.

On June 15, 1967 the Communist Party and the Federation appointed a joint working group to examine areas of agreement and disagreement, with a view to formulating common aims.

The working group submitted its first draft in October and we suggested that it be published and examined at an early

meeting of delegations from the Communist Party and the Federation. The Federation wanted the draft discussed again in the working group, and this was done in the last days of January and the beginning of February.

In the autumn, during the cantonal election campaign, we again appealed to all workers and democrats to urge discussion of the draft.

Today, more than ever before, everything depends on the mass movement. We Communists realize, of course, that unity depends not only on top-level conferences, though these are both useful and necessary, but to a far greater extent on the sweep of the unity movement, its mass support throughout the country.

A common program of progressive social demands must be an expression of the popular will. And this can be achieved only through intensified Party activity among the masses, through every Party member bringing our proposals on home and foreign policy to an ever larger number of people and obtaining their approval.

At Waldeck Rochet's suggestion, the Central Committee meeting of February 24 singled out these four major tasks for all Party members:

1. Support the economic and social demands of the workers of town and country following from the deterioration of their position as a result of the Gaullist regime's anti-social policy.

2. Continue the struggle against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam, for the victory of the Vietnamese people and in defense of world peace. (The Communist Party made a decisive contribution to the success of the Solidarity Ship campaign. It set up a national Vietnam Relief and Victory Committee which has hundreds of branches in factories, residential areas and villages.)

3. Acquaint the people with the Party's foreign policy program of peace and national independence.

4. Bring our propaganda to the level envisaged by the January 1968 Central Committee meeting. Proceeding from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, we must come out against bourgeois theories designed to divert the workers from the struggle, sow division in their ranks and thereby help reaction; we must come out also against leftist and adventuristic conceptions and right-wing opportunism.

In all this Party members can draw much from the pamphlet of our General Secretary, "What It Means to Be a Revolutionary in France Today," which has already sold 100,000 copies.

To cope with its tasks, the Party must grow and this calls for a special effort to recruit new members and start new branches.

By bringing to the masses our proposals for a common government program we can, and should, achieve further success in our unity effort.

12th congress of the CP of Norway

An interview with Party Chairman Ridar Larsen

The Twelfth Congress of the Communist Party of Norway was held in Oslo over March 22-24. Party Chairman **Ridar Larsen**, in an interview with **World Marxist Review**, talked about the situation in the Party, its new working program, and the Party's relations with the world Communist movement.

In recent years, Comrade Larsen said, the Party encountered considerable difficulties, stemming from the specific problems in Norway and in the world Communist movement.

The discussion of the reasons for the Party's declining influence dates back to the late fifties; it dragged on into the sixties and gradually turned into a negative factor.

Some comrades exaggerated the policy errors made by the Party to the extent of writing off its big part in the fight for progress and for the nation's interest during and after the war.

The discussion had negative consequences. Party workers were distracted from the current tasks and public interest in the Party declined.

The situation became particularly acute in 1961, when a third party, the Socialist People's Party (SPP) was formed by the Left in the Social-Democratic Party. The new party described itself as Left-Socialist and adopted a platform coinciding almost to the letter with the views of the Communists. Yet the SPP fenced itself off from the Communist Party with the old shibboleth that we were under "Moscow control."

Against the background of anti-communist propaganda many who had gravitated towards Communist policy experienced a change of heart, enabling the Socialist People's Party to gain a considerable following, largely among those who had previously supported the Communists.

While adding to the external difficulties,

Larsen said, this also sharpened the intra-Party struggle. A distinctly opportunist trend appeared, which, in the shape of a "broad unitarian policy," set out to reduce Party participation in the mass movements and to keep it from contesting elections, urging it to campaign for the Social-Democratic Party, which is pro-Nato and against whose anti-communism and other aspects of its policy our Party has fought for years.

A majority of the Central Committee rejected this trend with the near-unanimous support of the local branches. But the minority refused to submit, and mounted an open attack, publishing in the Social-Democratic press calls against the Communist Party. It should be borne in mind that the Communist Party offered to cooperate in the 1965 general election with both the Labor Party (Social-Democrats) and the SPP. Had the offer been accepted it could have prevented a capitalist majority and the change of government.

The differences in the world Communist movement, too, made a deep impression sparking off a discussion. The events in the world movement triggered an internal crisis, which came to a head at the Central Committee meeting in March 1967, when minority spokesmen insisted that members of the majority be ousted from all posts. When this incredible demand was rejected, they responded by resigning their own offices.

There is considerable support in the

Party for the political line elaborated, which can be summarized as follows:

The Party considers unity of the international Communist movement essential and will spare no effort to this end, but it does not consider itself obliged to defend the attitude of other Communist parties or socialist countries if there is any doubt concerning the validity for such solidarity.

We are ready to cooperate with all Left forces on a basis that rules out discrimination of any kind between parties. As far as inner-Party development is concerned, we are for a full and free exchange of opinions, but at the same time stress the necessity for voluntary discipline, that is to say, that Party decisions are binding on all members and functionaries.

As I already noted, Party policy is meeting with increasing support, and the Twelfth Congress—at which the minority in the Central Committee expressed its views—stressed this fact.

The discussion on the inner-Party struggle was balanced and to the point. Congress criticized the minority's attitude which had injured the Party, but at the same time supported the Central Committee in not resorting to expulsions as a means of resolving the issue.

The central item of discussion was the working Program. We are making a comprehensive study of the problems of Norwegian society, of our relationship to the outside world. We think it is time to dispense with general phraseology and clichés and tackle tasks that have a direct bearing on the situation.

The program proposals, which had been the topic of preliminary discussion in the Party, are now being submitted for further discussion in our branches and press. The program will in all probability be adopted at a national Party conference to be held next January.

The home policy section of the program deals with problems related to the growing concentration of economic power in the hands of a small group of capitalists and contains the demand for democracy in economic life.

The program shows how to solve the conflict between those regions of the country attracting investments and the economically weaker areas which are being abandoned by the population. The program proposes a tax policy restricting undesirable investments on the one hand, and on the other, a policy stimulating industrialization of the depressed areas where new

enterprises would be in the interests of society.

The program devotes much space to structural rationalization and automation. The closing down of enterprises is causing growing anxiety, and it is becoming clear that our country, which for many years boasted full employment, will have to face the fact that the right to work might become the key demand of the working people in the next few years.

The program dwells also on the problems in fishing and agriculture. Here irreconcilable contradictions exist between our possibilities to tap the riches of the surrounding ocean and our capacity to market them. The fishermen, whose trade is exhausting and poorly paid must be provided for economically. All the products obtained from the sea should be ensured a market.

The program advances similar solutions for agriculture which is beset by difficulties caused by growing competition. The present process of rationalization is not only resulting in more and more farms becoming redundant, but also in more and more farmland becoming derelict.

Despite the fact that our climate and our natural conditions do not favor farming, our action program speaks of the need for extended government aid and measures that will promote the wellbeing of the rural population and help advance agriculture along lines similar to producer cooperatives.

In a world where the fight to increase food production is becoming increasingly intense, the question of agriculture should be approached not from the profit aspect alone, the narrow criterion of that relatively small part of the world where food production is not a problem.

The central demand of our working program is for reforms that would assure the workers a say in management and on all other matters related to production.

The program advances the demand to create bodies that will represent the workers and the trade unions, that will be in a position to influence development, to prevent dismissals; bodies that will have the right to examine the financial documents of the respective enterprises and have a say in all matters relating to investments and distribution of profit.

We stress the need for control over the financial resources of society, over the big banks and insurance companies. But the Party also pays due attention to the key

enterprises which play a major role in the economy.

In the sphere of foreign policy the program advances as the principal task the elaboration of a policy that will restore to Norway complete freedom of action in all international issues, will release us from all relations of dependence, imposed on us as a NATO member, and enable us to counter the attempts to bring our country into the Common Market. It is obvious that the most urgent problem is to wrest Norway from the Atlantic Pact. This is the subject of intensive and widespread discussion; during the past few months more and more people are beginning to look for ways of freeing Norway from the fetters of NATO. The alternative—also the subject of much discussion—that could unite all opponents of NATO is for Norway to take her place among the neutral states.

The character of the country's defense is likewise being discussed. It is generally agreed that should Norway regain her freedom of action, become a neutral country, independent in her relations with other states, it would be possible to find a solution that will safeguard her security. The greatest interest, however, has been aroused by the alternatives for a solution on a Scandinavian plane. These include the creation of an atom-free zone in Scandinavia. Another issue is that of military cooperation with one or more Nordic countries. And needless to say, finding a solution on an European plane likewise figures largely in the discussion.

At present the thing is to unite on the widest basis possible all who want to divert the country's foreign policy from the NATO course. It is important to rally these forces before it is too late. Once Norway is neutral this will open many ways presently closed to her.

Here it will be pertinent to say something about how the movement against Norway joining NATO developed. Although at first the resistance to NATO participation—the way to which was prepared by an anti-communist campaign — was not widespread, it gradually developed into mass movements against nuclear armament, against the plans for nuclear weapons on Norwegian territory, the arming of West Germany and measures to draw her into NATO. However, it was the movement of solidarity with Vietnam that made the greatest impact. We can now clearly see how it awakened the consciousness of our people, spurred them to support the demand

for a new foreign policy. It can therefore be said that this solidarity movement directly influenced the broad movement in support of Norway's withdrawal from NATO.

This movement was also extremely important in arousing the interest of ever larger sections of the population in world problems, including the problems of the newly emergent countries. All this is part of the process which will influence internal development to an increasingly greater degree

Here it might be noted that the youth have in recent years become the most active and articulate group in the various movements I have mentioned.

Concerning the discussion on the international Communist movement the Communist Party of Norway follows the deep-rooted traditions of internationalism. We are deeply interested in the relations existing in the international Communist movement, and what our Party's attitude should be. Our Party has always held that good contacts with the Communist world movement are essential to all parties, big and small.

That is why our Party is very concerned about the difficulties in the international movement. We believe, and have stressed this in numerous decisions of the Central Committee, at conferences and congresses, that the unity of the international movement must be re-examined. The movement consists of many parties which work in different conditions. It is therefore only natural that there might be different views on problems which should not be fitted into a cut-and-dried pattern. We think that every Party should have the unrestricted right to elaborate its own viewpoint and policy everywhere, and on all questions, including home and foreign policy issues; that the international movement only stands to gain from this, and that unity can be restored only if the autonomy of each Party is respected. But in this we proceed from the premise that unity can be restored only as "unity in diversity."

We hold that despite the differing viewpoints there are fundamental questions that unite the Communist parties. These are their Marxist-Leninist basis, their common goal and common tasks in the struggle against imperialism.

We believe a businesslike exchange of views—preceding from a sober analysis of the situation—on the important issues

facing the international movement could help the parties better to cope with their tasks, just as we believe that continuation of uncomradely polemics can but cause new injury to the movement. That is why we are working to restore contacts between the parties.

The Twelfth Congress stressed that our Party, which knows that its weight in the international movement is not a big one, will work to establish comradely relations

between all the Communist parties and oppose any step that might deepen the split.

It was proposed at the congress that our Party should not participate in the forthcoming international meeting in Moscow. This proposal was rejected by the majority. The Congress decided to submit this question to the Central Committee for further consideration.

Eighth Congress of the CP of India

MOHIT SEN

The Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of India held in Patna (Bihar) from February 7 to 15, 1968 was permeated with a sense of unity, confidence and maturity.

The 703 delegates and 166 observers, representing a membership of 172,902 Party members (66,000 more than at the time of the Seventh Congress held at Bombay in December 1964) came from the field of seething mass struggles, from broad united front movements, from great electoral triumphs and equipped with fresh, rich experience, particularly in those five States (the Indian Union is made up of 18 States) where the Communist Party of India had been a partner in the coalition Governments formed after the Congress had been dislodged from office.

For nine days, both in plenary sessions, as well as in the separate commissions which examined the draft basic documents in detail, the delegates discussed and debated and arrived at unified conclusions in the true spirit of Leninist democracy. Never before in all its 43 years of existence had the Communist Party of India found itself so united ideologically, politically and organizationally.

The past three years in India have been a veritable testing ground between the line of the Communist Party of India, which creatively applies to the Indian conditions

the basic understanding of the Moscow Declaration and the Statement and the line which blindly accepted the outlook and tactics of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, adopted by those who split away from the Communist Party of India and regrouped themselves as the Communist Party of India (Marxist). Life itself has confirmed the former and repudiated the latter.

It was symbolic of the new position acquired by the Communist Party of India that for the first time in its history, its Congress was greeted by leading representatives of other Left and democratic parties. Later, the leaders of the Samyukta Socialist Party gave an official reception to the delegates from the fraternal Communist Parties who had come to Patna. This unprecedented fraternization was a fitting tribute to the Communist Party of India which had, not in words alone, but in selfless action, dedicated itself to the cause of Left and democratic unity, of rallying all democratic forces in a National Democratic Front to accomplish the National Democratic Revolution.

The Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of India was honored by the presence of fraternal delegations from the CPSU and ten other Communist and Workers' Parties. It received messages from many other fra-

ternal Parties. In their greetings and messages all the fraternal Parties hailed the heroic role that the Communist Party of India is playing in the struggle of the working people, for consolidation of India's national independence, for democracy and social progress. The fraternal delegates as also the messages passionately urged for the unity of all Communists in action, specially in support of the glorious people of Vietnam and for the unity of the international Communist movement. The presence of fraternal delegates, as also the messages, underscored the fact that our Party is marching in step with the international Communist movement. The presence, especially of the delegation from the CPSU, proved a source of great inspiration to all the delegates and observers, to the entire Party.

It was only in the fitness of things that the Party Congress commenced its work by the adoption of a declaration of fervent solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people, whose tremendous new offensive had thrilled the whole world.

THE CRISIS OF THE CAPITALIST PATH OF DEVELOPMENT

The main agenda of the Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of India was: (1) The Political Report of the National Council; (2) the Political Resolution; (3) Amendments to the Party Program; (4) the International Situation and Problems of the World Communist Movement; (5) Organizational Report and Amendments to the Party Constitution; (6) Election of the National Council and the Central Control Commission.

In addition, the Party Congress considered a number of other resolutions—on the situation in West Bengal where a tremendous popular struggle was taking place against the illegal dismissal of the United Front Ministry and the installation of a puppet Ministry by the Central Congress Government; in defense of the United Front Government in Kerala, against which the Central Congress Government was hatching sordid conspiracies in order to topple it; against the wave of communal riots which had taken place in different parts of India and which were an integral part of the counteroffensive of right reaction; greeting the democratic movement in Pakistan; supporting the Arab peoples and their progressive states; urging that the Government of India immediately recognize the German

Democratic Republic; protesting against the persecution of the Communists in Indonesia and West Germany; supporting the liberation struggles of the African peoples and many others.

Through discussions in the plenary session, as also in the commissions into which the Party Congress divided itself for purposes of detailed consideration, the delegates expressed themselves in general agreement with the general line of the documents presented by the National Council. At the same time, through criticism and the presentation of concrete amendments, the delegates improved all the documents, corrected their defects and rendered them still more effective as guidelines for the future. The Party Congress as a whole was an inspiring example of unity and the forging of still closer unity through frank exchange of views, experience and principled debate on controversial points. It demonstrated in practice the tremendous role of the adherence to the Leninist norms of Party Organization, the combination of democracy and centralism.

At the center of the attention of the Party Congress was, naturally enough, the nature of the new period in the post-independence history of India and the central slogan and other tasks of the Communist Party of India following from the assessment of that period. It was categorically stated that the basic features that characterize the economic and political developments in India center on the fact that the *capitalist path of development* pursued by the Congress rulers during the 20 years of freedom, has entered the phase of *acute crisis*, engulfing the whole country in its ruinous all-pervasive consequences. The inherent contradiction between the dictates of the private profits of the Indian capitalist class, especially the monopoly stratum, and the interests of independent, democratic development of the economy and the toiling masses, has burst into the open. There has been a debacle in our development and the economy has been engulfed by a special type of inflationary crisis. The independent development of the economy, which did take place to some extent, was accompanied by the growth of monopoly, by increased exploitation and hardship for the toiling masses none of whose problems were solved, by increasing concessions and reliance on the landlord and other vested interests in the rural areas and by growing dependence on foreign private monopoly capital and principally U.S. imperialist "aid". The de-

valuation of the rupee carried through by the ruling Congress clique in June 1966 at the dictation of the US-dominated World Bank, denoted a dangerous turning point in our economic and political life. Even at that time, the National Council of the Communist Party of India had characterized it as the blackest act of anti-national treachery since the winning of freedom. Devaluation had been followed by further dependence on imperialist "aid" in the shape of a so-called "liberal" import policy. The quantum of imperialist "aid," especially from the USA, had sharply declined, debt repayment burdens had tremendously increased, import of foodgrains under the notorious PL-480 had sharply risen and the open dictation of Indian policy by the neo-colonialists had become all the more insistent. The result was a sharp drop in the rate of growth of the national economy, from 1965-66 to 1966-67, leading to an actual decline in the already miserable *per capita* income of the people, to industrial stagnation, agricultural decline, unemployment accompanied by a runaway inflation. Even the limited state-capitalist planning that had been in operation was abandoned with the Fourth Five Year Plan put in cold-storage for four years.

The economic crisis had revealed the truth of the formulation of the Program of the Communist Party of India that *the attainment of economic independence would seem impossible under the capitalist path as it is in operation in India today. Now this truth is being recognized by ever increasing sections of our people. It is inexorably becoming a part of national consciousness itself.*

Naturally, in the Political Resolution and the Political Report adopted by the Party Congress these internal developments were viewed in the context of the developing crisis of the world imperialist system, the further accentuation of the third stage of the all-round general crisis of world capitalism. The growth of this crisis has led to an enormous increase in U.S. neo-colonialist pressure on India's economic and political life. This cannot but sharpen the basic contradiction between imperialism and the Indian nation as a whole, including the national bourgeoisie. The Indian monopolists, moving ever closer to collaboration with the imperialists, are seeking a way out of the crisis at the cost of the working people, the middle strata and even the non-monopolist national bourgeoisie. This cannot but sharpen the conflicts and contra-

dictions between the monopolists and the broadest sections of the Indian nation. An objective basis exists for building a broad democratic front and for isolating reaction. The more the leadership of the Congress surrenders to the imperialists, the monopolists and other reactionary forces, the more the objective basis widens for waging united mass struggles and building a broad, united democratic front against the reactionary policies of the Congress regime and, indeed, for ending Congress rule. At the same time, the maneuvering capacity of the Indian bourgeoisie must not be overestimated.

This analysis led to the conclusion that new features had appeared in the economic and political policies of the Congress leadership signifying further dangerous shifts to the Right. While the independent and positive features of Indian economic development are being increasingly undermined and sabotaged, the Indian economy has not qualitatively changed its character nor even entered the stage of becoming a satellite economy. It is very far from the truth to say that the contradictions between imperialism and the national bourgeoisie have been more or less resolved in favor of the former. Such an erroneous understanding would give rise to sectarian tactics and inhibit the role of the working class and the Party.

In this connection, the Party Congress positively assessed the significance of the disinterested economic assistance from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This assistance, it is true, is coming to India which is at present under the exclusive rule of the national bourgeoisie. But this assistance helps to overcome the legacies of the colonial past, build a modern economy and resist imperialist blackmail. Particularly in the present period of industrial recession, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have offered to buy large quantities of industrial products, thus providing a stable and expanding market and, in addition, enabling the Indian working people better to defend their wages and living standards. Such aid, therefore, has an anti-imperialist, democratic content.

But the opportunities afforded by socialist aid are not fully availed of under Congress rule, in which the monopolists and reactionaries exert considerable influence. There is considerable resistance to developing cooperation with the socialist countries within the ruling circles. But

even large sections of the national bourgeoisie are pushed in that direction by the growing contradictions between them and the methods of blackmail and pressure adopted by the imperialists.

THE CRISIS OF POWER

An exhaustive analysis was made of the policies and practice of the ruling Congress Party in the past three years. Its concessions to and surrender before the pressure of imperialism and reaction have not been confined to the economic sphere. Politically, it has launched upon a veritable offensive against not only the democratic parties and forces but against the very institutions and principles of parliamentary democracy. It has considerably watered down the non-aligned foreign policy, especially in the anti-imperialist sphere as, for example, in its refusal to condemn US imperialist aggression in Vietnam. All this was accompanied and was a reflection of the growing loss of the mass base of the ruling Congress Party and of its increasing disintegration.

The result of the Fourth General Elections (February 1967) has not only shown that the Congress rule was based on a minority of votes polled. It had not only shown a drastic drop in the percentage of votes polled by the Congress as compared to the previous elections. Even more significant was the fact that the twenty years uninterrupted monopoly rule of the Congress, though somewhat precariously retained at the Center with a greatly reduced majority, throughout India had been ended in nine states which were inhabited by a majority of India's population. The myth of the so-called "invincibility" of the Congress and the so-called "inevitability" of its rule had been blown skyhigh. The people of India had clearly demonstrated their desire that Congress rule must be ended and that too, as a matter not of distant perspective but as one of immediate action.

Faced with this electoral debacle, confronted with the nine non-Congress State Governments in the majority of which the Left and democratic parties held important positions, the Congress rulers had only become more desperate and launched upon further anti-democratic misadventures. They had shamelessly proclaimed their central task to be to topple the non-Congress Ministries. And they had set about their job by lavish use of money to bribe unstable

elements and, above all, not only by using the draconian powers at their command but also by flagrantly violating the elementary democratic provisions of the Constitution, to dismiss Ministries, dissolve the elected Assemblies and impose illegal minority puppet Ministries. They laid the axe to the very roots of parliamentary democracy and the hard-won democratic rights of the people.

But this offensive against democracy had boomeranged. It had further intensified the crisis within the Congress and further increased popular wrath against it.

The line adopted by the Party Congress is based on the thesis that *there was ample scope for effectively resisting the shifts to the Right and winning concessions for the working people from the national bourgeoisie and its class rule. It is based on the thesis that not only can the shift to the Right be effectively fought back but that the Left and democratic parties and forces, if united, could bring about a shift to the Left in the country as a whole.* The new content and meaning of this general shift to the Left, the line of the Congress emphasized, would take place only when Congress rule at the Center too is replaced by a government of democratic coalition, representing a new correlation of forces. It would be an illusion to think that the national bourgeois rule or the present Congress Government is at all amenable to such a general shift to the Left in the totality of its basic policies, notwithstanding its yielding to the pressures of the democratic forces on individual issues.

Under this condition the Party Congress was firmly of the view that only a general shift to the Left would enable India to emerge from the present crisis. How to effect such, therefore, naturally engaged its serious attention. It was emphatically of the view that, taking the experience of the recent years into account, the outlook was hopeful. What was the basis of this realistic optimism?

First, despite the aggravation of the international situation caused by the stepped up aggression of U.S. imperialism, above all in Vietnam, and the temporary, sectoral defeats suffered by individual contingents of the world anti-imperialist forces, the world balance of forces continues to tip in favor of the socialist camp and all anti-imperialist forces. The crisis of the world imperialist system has further deepened and inter-imperialist contradictions have grown. Simultaneously, the great Soviet

Union has forged ahead economically, politically, militarily and socially. So have the majority of the countries of the socialist camp. Taken as a whole, the alliance between the majority of the socialist countries, the progressive newly-independent States and the working class, democratic movements in the imperialist countries has been strengthened. The developments in India take place against this background of the continued advance of the world revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces.

Second, the offensive of the monopolies against the working people in order to shift the burden of the developing crisis of the capitalist path has galvanized the masses in India into unprecedented militant mass actions. Demonstrations, strikes and *bundhs* (general strikes of the workers combined with general cessation of all activity) have become the order of the day. The *bundhs* have successfully taken place not only in individual cities but over entire States and that, too, not once but time and again. Mass struggles have taken place not only around issues affecting the daily life of the people but on general, democratic issues as well. It is of the utmost significance that not only the workers and toiling peasants have taken part in great mass actions. The white-collar employees, teachers, non-gazetted government employees, doctors, engineers and, above all, students have taken to the path of militant action in an unprecedented fashion. One can say that the entire national, democratic forces have been on the move sometimes in coordinated action and at other times singly. Especially since devaluation and its aftermath, there has been a veritable national revolt against the Congress rulers and their capitalist path.

The Party Congress recorded with pride the great and, on occasions, the leading role played by the Communist Party of India in this eventful period. It has stood at the head of the masses whenever they went into battle. It organized the Great March to Delhi in September 1966 which brought into focus the entire national protest against devaluation. It played a leading role in the great *bundh* actions.

Third, this protest of the people found dramatic political expression in the results of the fourth general elections. Taking the country as a whole, it was the Left and democratic forces who made the major gain from the crack-up of the Congress monopoly of power. Following the spectacular defeat of the Congress in several

states, it is the Left and democratic forces which have grown stronger and more influential.

The Communist Party of India correctly foresaw that the outcome of the general elections would largely depend on the masses and mass actions in the unleashing of which it took a leading part. It further took the initiative for forging a united front of Left and democratic forces on the basis of a common minimum program at the level of the states as well as at the all-India level. It put as its central slogan the overthrow of the Congress from power at the Center in addition to similar slogans in respect of Congress Governments in the different states. Events have confirmed that if such Left and democratic unity had been forged, the Congress would certainly have lost its majority in the national Parliament.

It is unfortunate that such Left and democratic unity could not be forged because both the Samyukta Socialist Party and the CPI (Marxist) did not share the opinion of the Communist Party of India in this regard. Matters were made worse by the fact that the CPI (Marxist) regarded the defeat of the Communist Party of India as the major objective of its electoral strategy. Nevertheless, patient and persistent efforts by the Communist Party of India did lead to the emergence of limited united fronts in some states and to a minimizing of electoral conflict between the Left and democratic parties. All the more significant is it, therefore, that the Left and democratic forces made headway in Kerala, West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Tamilnad, Punjab as well as in the elections to the national Parliament.

Fourth, since the elections the Left and democratic parties and forces have made further advance. In the different non-Congress coalition Ministries, where they were participants, they were able to secure a measure of relief for the common people, to widen the sphere of democratic liberties, to prevent the police and coercive apparatus of the state from intervening in favor of the vested interests and to take initial steps in the direction of radical reforms. It should be remembered that the states of the Indian Union enjoy very limited powers and are largely at the mercy of the Central Government. The top bureaucrats, police officers and local vested interests did all in their power to sabotage the work of these Ministries. The monopolists and other vested interests, in active collusion with

the Central Congress Government, did their utmost to create conditions of insecurity, sabotaged production and tried to bribe unsteady elements in the ruling coalitions. The heterogenous character of the coalitions was another disadvantageous factor.

Despite all these limitations and disadvantages, the non-Congress Ministries served as levers to further advance the Left and democratic forces and to further reduce the prestige and influence of the ruling Congress Party. The struggle of the Communist Party of India in these coalitions for the implementation of the commonly accepted minimum program, to resist the attacks of the Congress Central Government, to forge closer unity of the Left and democratic parties and isolate Right reaction, bore fruit. The prestige of the Communist Party of India, of other Left and democratic parties, as well as of the concept of the United Front as a real alternative to the Congress, perceptibly rose. The Communist Party's clearcut stand for the unity of the Left and democratic parties and forces on the basis of a common minimum program has been increasingly appreciated and supported.

The Communist Party of India's participation in coalition governments with Right reactionary parties such as the Swatantra and Jana Sangh in Punjab, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar came in for detailed debate at the Party Congress. It endorsed the stand of the National Council in joining these Governments. It was of the view that such participation helped the Communist Party to remain with the masses and other Left Parties with a progressive democratic program as the real alternative to that of the Congress. Through the functioning of the coalition governments and the struggle waged within them, as well as through their own living experience, the people have been helped to see the kind of alternative to the Congress that is needed in their own interest.

The Political Report emphasized that, while participating in coalition governments with the Jana Sangh and Swatantra Parties, the Communist Party never lost sight of their reactionary character, never treated them as eligible for participation in the Left and democratic front, much less as allies in the democratic movement. The Communist Party consistently struggled to weaken and isolate reaction, both from within the coalition governments and from outside. Its principled and flexible tactics paid dividends not only to itself but to the entire Left and democratic movement.

Even as the Party Congress was in session, as well as in the months just before it, the non-Congress coalition Governments in West Bengal, Punjab and Bihar had been overthrown through the machinations of the vested interests and the thoroughly anti-democratic and anti-constitutional procedures adopted by the Congress rulers at Delhi. Parliamentary democracy and the hard-won democratic rights of the people were in danger of subversion at the hands of the reactionaries and the masses refused to take things lying down. They moved into militant, united mass action, headed by reinforced and more cohesive United Fronts. In the forefront stood the heroic people of West Bengal who launched three *bundh* actions within the space of as many weeks and then embarked on a massive civil disobedience campaign in which over 60,000 persons courted arrest. All the leonine violence and outrageous repression of the police which went on the rampage, could not cow them. Barely had the Party Congress concluded when this tremendous mass struggle was crowned with success. Mid-term elections and the removal of the Congress puppet Ministry were imposed by the masses on the Congress rulers. A similar fate arising out of a similar crisis clearly awaits them in Bihar and the Punjab.

This tremendous mass upsurge after the elections, in which the Communist Party of India played a most crucial role, thoroughly vindicated the basic political line of the Party. It demonstrated anew that success comes from skilfully combining parliamentary and extra-parliamentary struggles, from realizing unity for struggle and reinforcing unity through struggle. It confirmed the thesis of the Communist Party of India that it would be thoroughly erroneous to conclude that in India parliamentary democracy and democratic rights could not be defended from the onslaughts of the Congress rulers and other forces of reaction.

While noting these hopeful features of the situation, there was no underestimation of the lags and dangers as well. As the Political Report pointed out first and foremost comes the increased strength of the Right and the ferocious counter-offensive of reaction. Although in the fourth general elections, the Left and democratic forces had an edge over the Rightist parties like the Swatantra Party and the Jana Sangh, these parties, especially the latter, have made impressive gains in the elections.

The menace of Right reaction has been

heightened by the fact that the Rightist forces have grown stronger inside the ruling Congress Party, including its central leadership and the Central Government. The slogan has already been raised for a "national coalition" at the Center so that the Right reactionaries inside and outside the Congress can come together and take over the Central Government.

The basis for a reactionary coalition government at the Center is strengthened by the fact that the monopoly bourgeoisie can no longer rely on a single party to maintain its hated class rule.

The increased grip and power of monopoly over India's political and economic life, the increasing grip of the bureaucrats over the administration and the increasing penetration of the CIA and other agencies of U.S. neo-colonialism which actively back the Indian reactionaries, all add to the danger from the Right.

The counter-offensive of Right reaction assumes many forms. It takes the shape of the onslaught against the democratic non-Congress coalitions and the subversion of democracy. It takes resort to planned and widespread communal riots, whipping up linguism and chauvinism, staging pogroms against different minorities, in order to disrupt the working class and democratic movement. It seeks to divert popular discontent into revivalist and parochial channels.

All the decisions of the Party Congress emphasized that it would be a serious mistake to underestimate or minimize the real danger of the counter-offensive of reaction, arising from the greater degree of cohesion and political articulation of the forces of the Right, as well as their far greater degree of entrenchment in the Party organization and governmental leadership of the Congress and the upper echelons of the bureaucracy and military.

UNITY IS POSSIBLE AND NECESSARY

In order to dislodge the ruling Congress Party from power at the Center, without which no democratic coalition governments in the states would be safe, as well as to rebuff the counter-offensive of Right reaction, the biggest lag to be made up is the very far from sufficient unity of the Left and democratic parties and forces. *The unity of such forces and the evolution of a common democratic platform, as an alternative to Congress policies and to serve as the basis for a joint political battle against*

the counter-offensive of reaction, has become an urgent national necessity. Only such a program can enable the Left and democratic forces to overcome their present political weakness and disarray and give them the requisite striking power.

The Party Congress laid particular stress on the crucial role of Left unity and on overcoming the schism in the ranks of the Communists and establishing unity of action and mass organizations. The overcoming of the division in the Indian Communist movement was sharply underlined.

To facilitate the development of such Left and democratic unity, the Political Resolution adopted by the Party Congress has advanced a six-point democratic platform:

- defense of democracy and mass struggles against the subversion of parliamentary democracy, struggle for democratic changes in the federal Constitution of the country;

- defense of the wages, living standards and employment of the working people against the offensive of the employers and government;

- struggle for a national breakthrough in agriculture and for a national food policy based on radical land reforms, reasonable wages for agricultural laborers, reduction of tax and rent burdens, supply of credit and essential inputs, as well as commodities at reasonable prices, state-trading in foodgrains and stoppage of PL-480 food imports.

- struggle for defense of national sovereignty and for advance in the direction of economic independence through nationalization of banks, foreign trade, oil and through effective curbs on the monopolies and a moratorium on foreign debts;

- struggle for national integration and preserving the unity of the democratic and working masses; for safeguarding secularism; for protecting the rights of Muslims and other religious and linguistic minorities; for evolving a national consensus on the language issue; for more powers to the states, for solving inter-state disputes on a democratic basis; for the economic and cultural demands of the tribal peoples and for their right to full autonomy within the present state or statehood within the Indian Union; for full extension of autonomy, democracy and economic development to Jammu and Kashmir within the Indian Union; for beating back all communal, revivalist and chauvinist forces and trends.

- struggle for a foreign policy of peace and non-alignment; of active struggle

against imperialism and neo-colonialism; of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union, other socialist states as well as newly independent states; of all-out solidarity with the people of Vietnam; for recognition of the German Democratic Republic; for understanding and amity with Pakistan the way for which has already been paved by the Tashkent Agreement; for a no-war pact and a peaceful settlement of disputes with the People's Republic of China; for solidarity with the Arab peoples in their struggle to liquidate the consequences of Israeli aggression; for support to the national liberation movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The Party Congress decided to launch a nationwide campaign to popularize this platform, as well as to open dialogue and discussion on it with other Left and democratic parties and forces.

The Party Congress brought to a sharp focus the fact that in the present situation the question of a democratic alternative to Congress rule, both at the Center and in the states assumes urgent practical importance. The Communist Party of India regards it as its sacred duty in the coming period to work for the removal of the Congress from power at the Center and to replace it by a new government of democratic coalition, pledged to implement a democratic program of national regeneration. It has been made clear that such a government can come only when the Left and democratic forces unite and forge a common political front on the basis of a democratic platform. It has been directly envisaged that such a front will become the rallying point of democratic elements inside the Congress to break away from that organization and take their place inside the Front. It has been seen how such elements inside the Congress can best serve progressive causes by coming out of the Congress and identifying themselves with the Left and democratic movement. Revitalization of the Congress of today as a democratic force would seem the greatest illusion on their part.

In order to replace the Congress Government by a government of democratic coalition, the most militant mass struggles would be the main motive force. Without the broadest possible militant and widespread mass actions, it would be both opportunistic and futile to think in terms of the dislodging of the Congress from power.

It was stressed that the success of the militant all-India mass movement for secur-

ing mid-term elections in West Bengal, Bihar, Punjab and Manipur (or in other states where a constitutional deadlock and impasse in the assemblies has been created) in defense of democracy and the people's rights, and strengthening the hands of the Kerala Ministry to advance forward would consolidate the democratic forces and create the conditions for establishing a government of democratic coalition at the Center.

The Party Congress was fully conscious of the tremendous responsibility that was placed on the shoulders of the Communist Party. Precisely in order to build Left and democratic unity, immense independent mobilizing and organizing work would have to be done by the Party. Such independent initiative and action would be crucial in the coming period. Naturally, therefore, much time and attention was paid to gearing up and improving the Party ideologically, politically and organizationally. And, it was pointed out, that the important advance registered in all these spheres since the last Party Congress had laid a good basis for such tempering and improvement.

WEAKNESSES IN PARTY WORK

The Political Report as well as the Organizational Report adopted by the Party Congress ruthlessly laid bare the ideological and political weaknesses and deviations that had manifested themselves. There were certain tendencies of a Right, reformist character in the understanding of the Party line, particularly in relation to the ruling Congress party. The Party's correct line of overcoming the division between the masses following the democratic opposition and those following the Congress was at times wrongly understood to foster Right opportunist attitudes to the Congress, including overestimating the potentialities of democratic elements in the Congress, as well as overlooking the reaction of the masses under the Left Parties to some positive statements regarding approaches to the Congress.

Till the devaluation of the rupee in 1966, a number of leading comrades would not accept that there had been a shift to the Right on the part of the Congress. There were illusions among certain sections regarding the possibilities of development along the capitalist path and at times a non-class approach was adopted towards the Five Year Plans. The depth of the crisis in the ruling Congress Party was under-

estimated as also the magnitude of popular discontent against it.

The Communist Party had done far too little to mobilize the masses on burning international issues, including solidarity with Vietnam. During the Indo-Pak war, wrong tendencies were manifested of not keeping guard against the pressure of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism, of insufficient stress on the need to end the war, of not always being mindful of the specific nature of the Indo-Pak war and its implications for the internal life in our country.

The Communist Party had not displayed sufficient vigilance against the forces of Right reaction nor has it been as effective against them as it should have been. Even after the general elections, there has been some tendency to underestimate the danger posed by the growth of Rightist parties like the Jana Sangh and Swatantra. It is clear that unless the Communist Party grows strong in the areas where these two parties are growing alarmingly, it would not be possible to counter them effectively. The menace of anti-Muslim communalism has tended to be underestimated.

Although the Communist Party gave the correct slogan for Left and democratic unity and made some efforts to build it, it was not made an issue of mass popular campaign. After the general elections, initiative and effort in this direction were very insufficient.

In its Organizational Report and discussions thereon, the Party Congress laid the utmost stress on uprooting certain long-standing and serious defects in the sphere of building up the Communist Party of India as a truly revolutionary Leninist party of a new type. It repeatedly emphasized that there was a deep-seated deviation in the direction of spontaneity in the matter of Party building. The largely unconscious feeling was that the promotion and participation in mass struggles would by itself lead to the growth and consolidation of the Party. That Party building was simultaneously a constant and specialized work was practically forgotten. As a result, the growth of the Party lagged far behind its mass influence and the state of affairs in the Party organization was quite unsatisfactory. Despite the clear mandate given by the Seventh Party Congress, no specialized cadres were assigned for the work of Party building, Party Organizational Departments were not set up properly at the Party Center and in almost all the states.

The key weakness of the Party remained the long-standing one of failure to build a

dynamic, fully and constantly functioning all-India Party Center. Parochial outlook, departmentalism, insufficient and insufficiently equipped organizational apparatus and cadres continued to stand in the way. Severe criticism was made of the fact that the Leninist principle of check up and verification of work, as well as constant reports to and from the Party Center was not applied, leading to flabbiness and lack of co-ordination. It was mentioned as a most grave deficiency that the education of the Party membership was most criminally neglected. It was intolerable that no central Party school had been set up, no central syllabuses prepared and hardly any effort made to inculcate, not to speak of raising the level of, Marxist-Leninist consciousness among the Party members. Great stress was placed on the lamentable state of affairs wherein the basic units of the Party—the Party branches—functioned in a manner that left much to be desired. Most of the branches move only during campaigns and when moved from above are very far from being the nuclei of the Party among the masses. Lack of experience, training and low ideological-political levels were responsible for this sorry state of affairs.

While it was noted that Party membership had increased by over 50 per cent as compared to the position at the last Party Congress, it was still a drop in the huge ocean of India's masses. Vast areas were not covered by the Party at all, especially in the important Hindi-speaking areas.

It was pointed out that there was a veritable crisis of cadres in the Party from the Center down to the localities. The shortage of cadres is seriously hampering the further growth of the Party and is the result of decades-long neglect of this most crucial aspect of Party building. No conscious and systematic effort was ever made to study, select, train and promote cadres. In this connection, two further specific weaknesses were pinpointed: the working-class component in the leadership of the Party at different levels is very weak; the overwhelming majority of the leadership at different levels is of the middle-age group. The serious weaknesses of the Party journals and the neglect of regular collections from the masses for the Party were also sharply assailed.

It was further pointed out that many of these weaknesses were the result of wrong methods and approaches adopted in the mass fronts and organizations. Naturally, the Party does not grow in a vacuum and

if there are defects in its functioning on vital mass fronts, this would retard the growth of the Party itself. On the working-class front, trends of economism have grown and much reliance is placed on litigation and other legal work while ignoring the task of inculcating political consciousness among the workers. This explains why Party cadres are not emerging as rapidly as they should from the working-class and even the trade union movement is suffering from a lack of functionaries and cadres. Let alone socialist, Marxist-Leninist consciousness, very little is done to raise the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal consciousness of the workers. The Communist Party's failure on the peasant front is simply staggering. The dominant deviation in the field of peasants' organization has been of the liquidationist variety with very little consistent, day-to-day work in the villages. The position of the agricultural laborers' organization is no better. Work among the youth, students, women, intelligentsia and cultural sphere is very weak—which is taken full advantage of by the forces of neo-colonialism and Right reaction.

These weaknesses were brought out into the full glare of the public gaze not in any spirit of breast-beating nor in any spirit of defeatism. On the contrary, *the Party Congress boldly laid bare the shortcomings in the true spirit of Leninist self-criticism, i.e., in order to overcome them. The great advance registered by the Communist Party, its feeling of confidence and the unprecedented unity in its ranks, are precisely the reasons for a spirit of intolerance towards these weaknesses, particularly in the new period of economic and political crisis, a period of uncertainty and instability where grim and decisive battles loom ahead. It was in this spirit that the Party Congress adopted decisions to strengthen the Party Center, to provide organizational guarantees that the weaknesses would be overcome and further decisive advance registered. It decided to double the membership of the Party, double the circulation of its journals, raise rupees twenty-five lakhs (2.5 million) Party fund and build half a million volunteer corps of the Party by the First of May, 1969. It decided that special attention will have to be devoted to the vast Hindi-speaking areas of our country. Special attention is to be devoted to the ideological-political tempering of the Party members, to the bold promotion and training of cadres, especially to the recruitment and training of cadres from the working-class and other toilers and to the fostering*

of branch secretaries who would be able to act as real leaders of the masses and the Party branches. A determined drive would be launched against non-proletarian outlooks and practices within the Party together with a stress on the need for simplicity, austerity and sacrifice in the cause of communism. The Party Congress with confidence and unanimity mandated the new leadership to implement these urgent tasks.

CHANGES IN THE PARTY PROGRAM

Apart from tackling these ideological-political and organizational weaknesses in a spirit of ruthless self-criticism, the Party Congress took up the tasks of still further improving the most basic document of the Party—its Program.

With regard to the basic theses of the Communist Party of India's Program, adopted at the Seventh Congress, there was complete unanimity that not only had they stood the test of the past three turbulent years but that they had proved to be an unfailing and invaluable guide for the entire Party. The Program had correctly characterized the stage of the revolution as National Democratic, its character as anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopoly and democratic; the class forces to be united as the workers, the entire peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie and the non-monopoly national bourgeoisie. All these class forces, the Program pointed out, had to be brought together in a National Democratic Front. This National Democratic Front would itself be forged through furious class and mass movements and struggles against the present state which was the organ of the class rule of the entire Indian bourgeoisie. It could come to victory only by a revolutionary overthrow of this state and the seizure of power. The National Democratic state would reverse the gears of the capitalist development on to which India had been placed by the present ruling class and put it on the non-capitalist path to socialism. In the forging of the National Democratic Front, the working-class would play a leading role and the worker-peasant alliance would be the pivot of this front. As the struggle advanced, contradictions would sharpen among the Indian bourgeoisie, the differentiation would take place and the non-monopoly national bourgeoisie would come over to the National Democratic Front, become one of its constituents and help its further development. In this Front, the exclusive leadership of the working

class is not yet established though the exclusive leadership of the bourgeoisie no longer exists. As the advance towards socialism continues along the non-capitalist path, the working class will increasingly come to occupy the leading position in the National Democratic Front. The balance will shift in favor of the working class and the worker-peasant alliance, paving the way for the leadership of the working class in the state, thereby creating the conditions for transition to socialism. The Program further stresses that the Communist Party of India can and will strive to achieve the establishment of national democracy and create conditions for the advance to socialism by peaceful means, although the ruling class will not relinquish its power voluntarily and the revolutionary forces must be ready for swift reorientation and for all contingencies.

These and other basic theses were found by the Party Congress to have been validated by life and standing in no need of change. Absolutely nothing fundamental in the Program of the Communist Party of India stood in need of change or amendment. But certain ambiguities needed to be removed and certain formulations needed to be sharpened.

The amendments adopted have made it clear beyond doubt that the Program of the Communist Party of India is of the view that the capitalist path of development itself—and not merely its “compromising and reactionary features”—stands in the way of India attaining full economic independence and national prosperity. It has also been made clear that the *Communist Party of India presents in its program the non-capitalist path of development in order to create the precondition for the transition to socialism*. This will remove any scope for illusion or reformist understanding of the capitalist path and strengthen the revolutionary struggle against it.

The Program, as now amended, leaves no room for ambiguity or misinterpretation about the need to end both the capitalist path and the national bourgeois rule. The need to overthrow the ruling Congress Party from power is made completely explicit.

By another amendment, the Program is now quite categorical and positive about the leadership of the National Democratic Front. It now states that in this class alliance, the leadership “belongs to firm anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-monopoly forces” though the sole leadership of the

working class is not regarded as the precondition for the building of the National Democratic Front and the establishment of the National Democratic state.

It has also been decided by the Party Congress that a Commission appointed by it will go into a detailed study of the agrarian situation as it now stands and work out a comprehensive and concrete understanding of the peasant question. It was also decided that the chapter in the Program dealing with political parties be altogether deleted as it is not appropriate in such a basic document. At the same time, the Party Congress directed the newly-elected National Council to prepare and adopt a document on the question of political parties for the tactical guidance of the Party.

FOR WORLD COMMUNIST UNITY

As one of the contingents of the international Communist movement, the Communist Party of India has naturally been an active participant in all the efforts to restore and strengthen the unity of the movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The Party Congress took up for consideration the report of the National Council on the International Situation and Problems of the World Communist Movement. The Report, after some minor amendments and detailed discussion, was adopted by it. The Party Congress was of the opinion that events had vindicated the stand taken by the Communist Party of India on these problems, a stand whose basic approach had been outlined at the Seventh Party Congress. It was further of the opinion that the main theses of the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and the Moscow Statement of 1960 had been confirmed by life and retained their validity.

The Party Congress repudiated the view that because of the split in the international Communist movement and because of temporary, sectoral setbacks suffered by the world anti-imperialist forces, it was no longer the socialist camp and the world anti-imperialist forces that determined the main trend of world social developments. It was emphatically of the view that the international Communist movement and all anti-imperialist forces had to learn deep lessons from these reverses. It was emphatically of the view that all ideas that the path ahead would be smooth and straight and without zigzags had to be

abandoned. Yet it stressed that the growing strength of most socialist countries, especially the great Soviet Union, the serious accentuation of the crisis of the entire system of world imperialism, economically, politically and socially, the advance of the working class and other anti-monopoly forces in the imperialist countries; the continued disintegration of the colonial system and the development of some newly independent states on the non-capitalist road—all combined to continue the ripping apart of the world balance of forces in favor of peace, freedom, democracy and socialism.

The struggle in Vietnam and the invincible resistance of its heroic people, backed by the Soviet Union, other socialist countries and other anti-imperialist forces and the crisis it had caused in the U.S. itself, was an eloquent testimony to this growth. The increased aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism and the sharp aggravation of the international situation had to be seriously noted and countered. These, however, were not signs of its growing strength but rather of its desperation and its hopes to utilize the disunity and the weaknesses in the world anti-imperialist front.

The Party Congress stressed that the most vital and imperative conclusion that emerges from the developments in recent years is the urgent need of a world gathering of Communist and Workers' Parties. The times call out for a decisive rebuff to the increased bellicosity and aggressive acts of the U.S. imperialists. The key requisite of such a rebuff is the maximum unity of the world Communist movement in a struggle against world imperialism. And this unity, as well as the coordination in action of all the world anti-imperialist forces can best be ensured by a frank discussion and arriving at common conclusions at a world conference of fraternal parties. The Communist Party of India had proposed that such a conference be held from the platform of its last Congress and press for it at the 18-Party Consultative Conference held in Moscow in early 1965. It was a signatory to the invitation sent out for the participation of fraternal Parties at the Budapest Preparatory Conference

The Communist Party of India has absolutely no desire to exclude the Communist Party of any country whatsoever from such a conference. Its entire intention is that the conference should reinforce the unity of the world Communist movement, to win more allies for it in the struggle against world imperialism, to work out the possibilities of coordinated action. Above

all, the Communist Party of India is emphatically in favor of concrete, common action to aid the valiant people of Vietnam and to deal a devastating blow to the U.S. imperialist aggressors.

The Party Congress was also of the opinion that it would be useful for the international conference to assess and generalize, as far as possible, the rich experience that has accumulated since the 1960 Moscow Conference. Naturally, the actual scope of the issues to be discussed and decided would have to be decided by the common consent of the participants and cannot be decided by any particular party. It would be useful to examine the experience of the struggle for national democracy and the non-capitalist path in the newly independent states; the question of forms of struggle in different parts of the world; a thorough examination of the causes and factors that give rise to the cult of the personality as well as nationalist and hegemonistic tendencies in the international Communist movement; the need for the maximum possible democratization of the internal life of Communist Parties and the swiftest possible strengthening and development of socialist democracy. It was essential that not only should the world Communist movement equip itself with new theses embodying new experience but also that it should guard against the repetition of old errors and deviations.

The Party Congress laid bare the anti-Marxist-Leninist theses of the recently adopted document on the international Communist movement by the leadership of the CPI (Marxist). It was of the view that this document is fundamentally a reproduction of the alternative general line advanced by the Maoists in June 1963. This document has naturally given rise to bitter controversy within the ranks of the CPI (Marxist) not only because it echoes the ideological positions of the Maoists but also because some very influential sections within that party feel the document does not go far enough in that direction. The CPI (Marxist) leadership is accused of neo-revisionism and opportunism. The Party Congress has also taken due note of the fact that events in India and abroad had proved the complete bankruptcy of their line and overwhelming mass pressure, as well as their own experience, had made them agree to unity in action with the Communist Party of India and other Left and democratic forces as well as to participate in or support the non-Congress democratic

coalition Ministers in some States. The Party Congress, therefore, gave the clarion call for unity in action with the CPI (Marxist), for persisting in patient effort to restore the unity of the Communist movement in India. It appealed to the CPI (Marxist) to reconsider and repudiate its allegiance to the ideological-political positions of the Maoists and called for ceaseless ideological-political struggle against this erroneous and disruptive line.

* * *

The Party Congress concluded its labors by electing the new National Council of 101 members (28 of whom were elected for the first time) and 10 candidate members (an innovation introduced by present Party Congress) as well as a Central Control Commission of seven members. The new National Council met immediately afterwards and unanimously elected a 25-member Central Executive Committee. It also unanimously elected Comrade S. A. Dange as its Chairman and Comrade C. Rajeswara Rao as its General Secretary.

Throughout the Party Congress, thousands upon thousands of workers, peasants,

students, employees and middle-class persons from throughout the state of Bihar had thronged to the venue of the Party Congress. The people of Bihar, despite their terrible poverty and the dreadful successive droughts, had contributed liberally in cash and kind for the successful running of the Party Congress. Thousands of uniformed volunteers were a heartening and prominent feature of the Party Congress.

On the final day, a massive procession of 50,000 men and women, drawn from all the districts of Bihar and headed by the delegates of the Party Congress paraded the streets of Patna. It concluded in a huge rally of 200,000 which listened in wrapt attention to the speeches of the leaders of the Communist Party of India, the head of the CPSU delegation and other fraternal delegates. It was agreed by all observers that the procession and meeting were unprecedented in the recent history of Patna and Bihar. It signified a decisive breakthrough of the Communist Party of India in the vital Hindi-speaking region of India. It was a fitting finale to the historic Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of India.

Action program of the CP of Czechoslovakia

At the beginning of April 1968 a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Party approved the political Action Program of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The program follows from the decisions of the Thirteenth Party Congress and is their creative elaboration. Work on it was based on the results of the recent Central Committee meetings which discussed the potentialities of our country's further progressive socialist development in the new political and economic conditions of building a developed socialist society in Czechoslovakia.

What questions, briefly speaking, were examined at the December (1967), January and April (1968) plenary meetings?

The December meeting dealt primarily with economic policy and living standards

in 1968. It also passed a decision supporting the convening of a Consultative Meeting of Communist and Workers' parties in Budapest. The activity of the Party, particularly of its Central Committee and various other bodies was also the subject of serious debate.

The 1968 January meeting was a continuation of the December meeting. It arrived at the conclusion that in the sixties socialist society in Czechoslovakia had entered a new period of its development, one characterized by the absence of antagonistic classes and contradictions. Hence, whatever contradictions may arise can no longer be resolved by the methods applied at the initial stage of socialist construction, which was marked by a sharp class struggle. The main content of Czechoslovakia's

internal development is the convergence, union and cooperation of the different classes and groups. With the development of the scientific and technological revolution the cooperation of the different classes and social groups, particularly of the working class, peasantry and the intelligentsia has acquired new meaning.

The recent period in the life of our country was characterized by serious shortcomings in the work of the Party whose methods and manner of performing its leading role were not adjusted to the conditions in which the Party is carrying out its activity at the present stage of development. There was particularly sharp criticism of the discrepancy between words and deeds, between the political objectives proclaimed and their realization. The old methods of work of the Party bodies and organizations led to depreciation of the role of government and economic bodies, of the mass organizations.

A critical analysis showed that failure to understand the new situation caused distortion of the Party's policy; that shortcomings and mistakes were often ascribed to imaginary and not to actual political causes. Hence the tendency to settle problems through directives. Far from removing contradictions, this only weakened the dynamic unity of our society.

On the basis of an analysis of the present situation, the Central Committee meetings decided to abolish the practice of one person holding two posts, those of First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party and President of the Republic. Alexander Dubcek was elected First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. On March 30, 1968, Ludvik Svoboda was elected the new President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. A new government was formed, headed by O. Cernik who in April submitted to the National Assembly a new government program.

The April plenary meeting elected a new Presidium and Secretariat of the Central Committee and approved the Action Program. At this meeting Comrade Dubcek stated: "The movement that started during the January plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia bears a strikingly socialist and democratic character; it was set in motion by our Communist Party and its notable feature is the unprecedented activity of our citizens."

Heightened political activity is, indeed,

a notable feature of the situation in the country today. This activity is manifested in the most diverse forms. The ways of developing socialist democracy are being discussed far and wide—in the Party, public organizations, in the press, over the radio and TV. How to improve the methods of Party work, to apply them correctly and democratically in the new conditions was the subject of lively debate at district and regional Party conferences.

This political activity was one of the principal sources in the elaboration of the Action Program. The Program in its turn, which has been adopted by the Central Committee, has become a major political document defining the course of both practical activity and further discussion of the ways of Czechoslovakia's socialist development.

The Action Program proceeds from the positive values created in Czechoslovakia, after its liberation by the Soviet Army in 1945, in the process of building the new socialist life. These gains are the pride of the Czechoslovak Communists and the entire people. The socialist transformations effected in our country created a material and spiritual base whose further development irrefutably proves the advantages of the socialist system over the capitalist. While it objectively appraises the successes achieved on the way to socialism in Czechoslovakia, the Action Program at the same time critically analyzes the cause and effect of the serious shortcomings and deformations which prevented the potentialities of socialism manifesting themselves more fully in our country. But the salient feature of the program is its projection into the future.

Comrade Dubcek stressed that the program "opens the door to fundamental structural changes in our society, gives socialism new dynamics which correspond to the changed social, economic, cultural and also to the specific national conditions. Realization of this program can and must open the way to tackling the new complex and important problems connected with the organization and dynamic development of our socialist society along lines which for the present can only be charted. Socialism will be able to develop more dynamically only if we set in motion its untapped forces, if we experiment boldly and sensibly, relying on creative Marxist thought. It is in this process that the Party's new general line will be evolved and elaborated."

The working class, tried and tested in struggle against the bourgeoisie, and which

has proved by its entire labor and political activity that it is capable of being the main force in socialist construction, remains the guarantee of the further development of the socialist system of Czechoslovakia. The Action Program refers as follows to the role of the working class:

"The Party relies, and will continue in the future to rely on the working class which has proved its ability to shoulder the main weight of the socialist effort. In the present conditions we rely particularly on those workers who by their consciousness, i.e., their profound understanding of the real interests and tasks of the working class in the revolutionary reconstruction of society, by their skills and efficiency, their ties with modern technology, and their social activity are greatly contributing to the continued progress of our production and our society. The working class joined the revolutionary struggle to abolish all exploitation and class barriers, to make it possible to free all people and together with them to transform the conditions of man's life and the character of his labor, to give full scope to his abilities and thus to enable him to refashion himself. These long-term interests of the working class have not been fully realized yet. However, the worker is today receiving new technological, social and cultural means which are enabling him to make further headway in changing his conditions and to broaden the scope of his creative endeavor. We mean to give apply all its creative energies to this end."

One of the achievements of socialism is the organic convergence of the cooperative peasantry with the working class. Economic equality of agricultural and industrial enterprises, the formation of a nationwide cooperative organization as the spokesman of the peasants—all this is indicative of the deepening unity of interests of the working class and the cooperative peasantry in the process of socialist development. The Party is confident of the ability of the cooperative peasantry to act independently and in a socialist way.

Another social force is the people's intelligentsia whose importance in socialist development is growing. It is a force which participates creatively in social development, bringing the treasures of science and culture within reach of the entire people. Cooperation of the technical intelligentsia with the workers, in the course of which they unite their forces, breaks down the class barriers of the past. The Party will support the growing unity of the intelligentsia and the working class, will combat

underestimation of the role of the intelligentsia in our society, everything that hampers the development of fruitful relations between the intelligentsia and the working class; it will uphold fair remuneration for creative labor.

THE LEADING ROLE OF THE PARTY IS THE GUARANTEE OF PROGRESSIVE SOCIALIST DEVELOPMENT

Fully subscribing to the Leninist thesis regarding the vanguard role of the Communist Party in a socialist society, the Action Program gives a generalized definition of the role of the Party in contemporary conditions. The Communist Party triumphed in the struggle against capitalism and for the accomplishment of revolutionary class changes as the party of the working class. With the victory of socialism it becomes the vanguard of the whole of socialist society. The Party has proved its ability to lead our society most conclusively by initiating the present process of democratization to which it has imparted a socialist content.

The Party rests on the voluntary support of the people and performs its leading role not by dominating society, but by faithfully serving its free, progressive socialist development. From this it follows that as a historical factor of social, economic and political changes in society the Communist Party must not decree its authority but steadily win it by its deeds, by the work of Communists, by its sense of equity and creative realization of Communist ideals.

The Party's mission is, before all else, to promote socialist initiative, to show the way and real possibilities of the Communist perspective and through persuasion and the personal example of Communists to win over the working people. The Party organizations must encourage activity and orientate it on tackling the vital problems. The Party must not be an organization that exerts its influence on society only through its ideas and programs. It must develop its practical organizing functions as a political force in society through its members and respective organizations and committees. It is through the Party's political and organizing activity that the practical effort of people is coordinated to put into effect the Party's line and programs in all spheres of social, economic and cultural life.

The Party's effectiveness also in the new conditions stems from its ideological and organizational unity based on broad inner-party democracy. The most effective weap-

on against bureaucratic methods being introduced in the Party is to enhance the influence of members on shaping Party policy, to strengthen the role of democratically elected bodies. The elected Party bodies must guarantee before all else that Party members will be able to exercise their rights, that decisions will be taken collectively and that power will not be concentrated in the hands of one person. The Party, however, must not forego the principle according to which once a decision has been taken every Communist is expected to abide by it. In the Party all members are equal, irrespective of whether or not they hold a post in the Party or government, or in an economic body.

Democratization of Party life also means strengthening the ties between the Party and science. Consultations and exchanges of views should be practised, and the most should be made of the results of research in framing and realizing decisions.

As a social organization the Communist Party does not represent the individual interests of the members of society. The political expression of their diverse interests is the National Front, that is, the political parties and mass organizations in it. The relationship between the political parties, based on the principle of partnership, follows from the general political program of socialist construction, from the socialist character of social relations in our country, and is in accordance with our socialist Constitution. The National Front, therefore, consists of political parties which are not divided into ruling and opposition parties in the sense that an opposition to state policy as the policy framed by the National Front can be formed and a political struggle conducted for state power.

Possible differences and contradictions in the attitudes of the various components of the National Front, or controversies over government policy, are settled on the basis of the common socialist concept of the National Front's policy, on the basis of mutual understanding. The attempts to create a political force in opposition to this concept, and to remove the National Front from political leadership in general, were rejected back in 1945. This approach, stemming from the tragic experience of our two peoples in the prewar period of the Czechoslovak Republic's political development, is just as valid today. The Communist Party will democratically implement the Marxist-Leninist concept of socialism as the basic condition of the development of a socialist society. It will work to win

the support of the working class and the working people generally for this concept.

Obviously, public organizations cannot replace political parties; just as obviously, political parties must not prevent such organizations as represent the interests of the workers and other strata from directly influencing state policy, its formulation and effectuation. The Party will promote in every way such political forms as enable the working class and the people to participate directly in discussing and resolving all political problems.

FOR THE GROWTH OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY, FOR A NEW SYSTEM OF POLITICAL GUIDANCE

In the past ten years the Party has frequently called for broader socialist democracy. It took measures to elevate the role of the elective bodies and emphasized the importance of voluntary public organizations and various forms of individual activity. But pernicious features of centralized government with elements of bureaucracy persisted all the same in our political system.

The Central Committee is determined to put an end to this situation. Comrade Dubcek pointed out that primarily "the proposed Action Program makes for unity of action to realize the main tasks of our development, serving as a good stimulus for socialist initiative and showing how to remove the obstacles to further growth in accordance with present demands—chiefly the obstacles of excessive centralism and armchair administration rooted in political leadership."

Before the 14th Congress, the Action Program says, we must work out the main aspects of our political system into a conception consistent with the present needs—to do just what we did with the fundamental conception of the new economic system.

The aim is to remould the political system so that it will ensure dynamic growth of social relations, combining broad democracy with scientifically competent government, strengthening the social system, stabilizing social relations and tightening public discipline. The main features of this political system should provide dependable guarantees against any return to the old methods of subjectivism and abuse. It is therefore essential to begin working on a new Constitution, the main aspects of which should be thoroughly and competently discussed by the public and thrashed

out by the National Assembly immediately after the next Party congress.

The situation must be changed between now and the 14th Congress: socialism's growth and intrinsic dynamism must no longer be inhibited by the obsolete element in the political system. This applies to a number of questions, such, for instance, as the role and purpose of the public organizations.

People join voluntary organizations because these express and uphold their interests. Mass organizations have their own structure and their own methods of work, and their ties with the membership should correspond to the new social conditions. The main task of the Communists in these organizations is to work selflessly, to win the trust of the other members and to be among those foremost workers elected to the leading bodies on the strength of their public service.

In accordance with the freedom of association guaranteed by the Constitution, and the projected law on societies and unions, there may appear voluntary organizations and societies representing different group interests, etc., satisfying the needs of different groups and groupings on an autonomous basis, without any claim to monopoly. Freedom of religion and of the performance of religious rites is guaranteed.

The Communists will combat in open ideological battle, before the people, any attempt by opponents of socialism to take advantage of the democratization process. The only way to win the allegiance of citizens to the ideas and policy of the Party is by persuasion, by comparing viewpoints, by relations of trust, by complete and truthful information, by practical activity for the public good, activity based on scientific analysis.

As envisaged in the Action Program, freedom of speech will be fully assured by the law, with administrative suppression totally ruled out. As a result, the activity of the publishing houses and the personnel of mass information media will increase and greater responsibility will devolve on them for spreading socialist ideas and promoting the policy of the Party, the National Front and the state. The Action Program also envisages concrete safeguards for the constitutional rights of citizens, including the right of movement, that is, the possibility for our citizens to leave the country for longer stays abroad.

The legal protection of the personal rights and the individual property of citizens must be made more effective. Citizens

contending for their lawful rights and demands should not be at a disadvantage in relation to the state and other bodies. It is therefore necessary to assure in law that all institutions strictly observe the rights and interests of citizens.

The Action Program also deals with the legitimate demand for the rehabilitation of Communists and other citizens victimized in the fifties, during the time of the deformations caused by the personality cult. Rehabilitation will be carried out in accordance with the law with all the pertinent legal and civil consequences.

The Party holds that a broad democratic interpretation of the political and personal rights of citizens, of their legal and political guarantees, is essential for public discipline and order, and for stabilizing socialist social relations. Any egoistic interpretation of civil rights, misuse of public property along the principle of "what isn't mine can rot," and opposing personal interests to those of society—all this the Communists will combat firmly.

The Action Program rejects the notion that democracy is an aim in itself connoting permanent discussion and flaunting the demands of discipline, competence and effective administration. It defines democracy as an inseparable unity of words and deeds, with the growth of democratic relations forming the core of all the efforts devoted to the general advancement of socialism.

Excessive concentration of power in any single link of the state machinery, in any apparatus or individual, should not occur. Powers should be so divided and a system of mutual control so instituted that the possible mistakes of one link can be corrected by the work of another in good time. This principle should govern not only the relations between elective and executive bodies, but also within the apparatus of state and government, including the status and function of the courts of law.

In reference to the role of the elective representative organs, the Action Program stressed that National Committees, the representative and executive organs of the people, should not be viewed as local bureaucratic institutions running public utilities and community services. According to the Action Program, the political purpose of the National Committees is to protect the rights and demands of citizens, to facilitate the examination of all matters brought before them by citizens, promoting the public interest and fighting all attempts

by any institution to ignore the lawful demands of citizens.

The Party considers the National Assembly to be the socialist parliament in a socialist democratic republic. The formalism that pervaded its work is now being eliminated. The National Assembly discusses proposed legislation and important political questions, and considers the proposals submitted to it. Its function of control over all public affairs, particularly with respect to the government, is increasing visibly. The Action Program stresses all these functions of the National Assembly, because all elements in its activity should be geared to its basic role of the supreme organ of power.

THE EQUALITY OF CZECHS AND SLOVAKS IS THE MAIN FORCE OF THE REPUBLIC

The Czechoslovak Republic is a state of two equal peoples—the Czechs and the Slovaks. The relationship between the fraternal peoples and the situation of the other nationalities are based on the principle of unity and accord, as socialism requires, with the needs of the peoples and nationalities.

The equality of Czechs and Slovaks is an earnest of strength. However, in the past the activity of the national organs in Slovakia was at a low ebb. The condition of Czechs and Slovaks being differently expressed in state policy, the Slovak national organs exercised but an insignificant influence on government, which inevitably caused misunderstandings between the two peoples.

The time has come, therefore, to inaugurate a socialist federative arrangement as the most suitable form for the coexistence of our two equal peoples in their common socialist state. The principle of federation shall be inscribed in the Constitution. In the meantime, the present unsatisfactory situation will be remedied step by step. The Action Program recommends a constitutional law providing for the following:

- a National Council of Slovakia as the legislative body and a Council of Ministers of Slovakia as the collegiate executive body, and relevant ministries as executive bodies of the National Council of Slovakia;

- guidance of the National Committees in Slovakia by the Slovak national bodies;

- the framing and approval of economic plans and of the budget of Slovakia to be placed in the competence of the Slovak national bodies;

- restoration of the institute of state secretaries in the ministries of national defense, foreign affairs and foreign trade, with the state secretaries acting as members of the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (the offices of minister and state secretary being apportioned between members of the two nationalities). The principle of socialist federation will in all respects be recorded in the projected new Constitution.

To strengthen the unity, solidarity and national identity of all the nationalities in the Republic—Hungarians, Poles, Ukrainians and Germans—a charter should be framed to define the place and the rights of the various nationalities, guaranteeing their free national development.

ON THE ECONOMIC REFORM

The economic reform is logically connected with democratic growth. The present political questions requiring new solutions cannot be separated from the democratization of the economy, which envisages a relative independence of enterprises and their amalgamations from bodies of state, and the right and opportunity for various groups of people and various social groups to express and promote their economic interests in the process of framing economic policy.

It is highly important to define the economic status of enterprises and their powers and responsibilities. The collectives of socialist enterprises should feel the results of both good and bad management at enterprise level, and have the means to influence management accordingly.

Therefore, it is essential to establish democratic bodies vested with definite powers in relation to the management, enabling them to participate in the discussion of key issues at enterprise level. These bodies should be part of the management, not public organizations, and should not be identified with the trade unions. According to the Action Program they will consist of elected representatives of the personnel and of other sections of the public, whose purpose it will be to protect the interests of society as a whole and ensure competent management. Representation of the said sections of the public should be subject to democratic forms of control. The status of these new bodies will be defined in a relevant charter.

The authority and indivisible powers of the managerial staff remain. The role of the trade unions will be extended. Their

main function will center on the welfare of their members, on protecting their interests. In addition, the unions will have the independent function of partners in discussing questions of management and promoting the economic and social interests of the people. Thereby the unions will perform still more effectively their role of educator and organizer of factory and office workers, enlisting their participation in resolving the tasks of socialist construction.

Agricultural cooperatives are playing an ever bigger role in the economy. Establishment of a nationwide organization of cooperative farmers, the right of the agricultural cooperatives to operate in other fields and to sell part of their farm produce directly to the population and the retail agencies—these are the immediate steps envisaged in the new approach to agriculture. New ties are projected between the rural producers and the supply and procurement agencies.

Cooperatives have proved to be a suitable form also in some branches of industry and in the service field.

Accent is being laid on restoring the functions of the market as an indispensable means for the proper operation of the socialist economy. The market is beginning to show whether or not the labor put into commodities is socially useful. Being a socialist market, it will be regulated, with the plan and the national economic policy acting as a positive force normalizing the market and counteracting any tendencies towards imbalance and monopoly control.

Czechoslovakia's economy is a part of the economy of the socialist camp. Aspects of effectiveness and mutually advantageous exchange are already being realized in the relationship between CMEA member-countries, which is reflected in the level of production of all the partners. Equality and mutual advantage without discrimination is, therefore, the basis of international economic cooperation.

The Action Program also deals at length with the role and significance of science, the topical problems of improving education, and refers to the humane purpose of culture in our society.

* * *

The changes in the life of Socialist Czechoslovakia are based on deep-going discussions and initial experimental veri-

fication. There exist both general and specific points of departure. Observance of the general principles strengthens the socialist community, while the specific points promote political activity and enhance socialism's power of attraction in the world.

Comrade Dubcek stressed that "proletarian internationalism, its practical operation in the relationships with other socialist countries and the world Communist movement as a whole, observance of our main social interests, and our support of all social progress in the world, constitute and will always constitute the basis of the foreign policy of our socialist country."

The above is also spelled out in the Action Program, which proceeds from the principle of the unbreakable Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship and internationalist cooperation with the socialist countries, with all forces of peace, democracy, national liberation and social progress.

The Action Program defines clearly Czechoslovakia's place in the fight against imperialism, colonialism and imperialist aggression, working for the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The Party intends to work more actively in the world Communist and working-class movement, devoting itself especially to promoting friendly ties, mutual consultations and exchanges of experience with the Soviet Communist Party, the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist community, and all the other fraternal Communist parties. It will continue to work for the unity of the world Communist movement, for joint action by the Communist parties and all progressive forces, and considers joint struggle against the aggressive imperialist policy of the United States as its most important task. It will make the most of its specific possibilities for establishing contacts with socialist, peace-loving and democratic forces in the capitalist and the developing countries. It will help to extend the forms of cooperation and coordination among Communist parties, attaching great importance to international conferences. It is from this standpoint that it welcomes and supports the results of the Budapest Consultative Meeting of Communist and Workers' parties and, together with dozens of other fraternal parties, backs the proposal to hold a World Communist Conference in Moscow at the end of 1968.

L.A.

Constitutional dictatorship and violence

Desperation of reactionaries

Archbishop Casariego of Guatemala, kidnapped by a Rightist terrorist organization, was released several days later some 200 km from the capital. Although the kidnapers were known, the government tried to place the blame for the kidnapping on the forces of the Left. It is logical to ask, therefore, what is happening in Guatemala?

Dismayed by the political crisis and steadily growing revolutionary process, the reactionaries are resorting to extreme acts of repression.

The kidnapping of the Archbishop was the culminating point in a campaign of intimidation to neutralize that section of the Catholic priesthood who are urging socio-economic and political reconstruction in line with the Encyclicals of John XXIII and Paul VI.

Earlier, "underground" Right extremists accused the Archbishop of lending his official motor-car to revolutionary leaders, sheltering guerrilla leaders at his residence, etc. In the event of the papal nuncio not punishing him for this, the reactionaries declared, they would take "the law" into their own hands.

So the country knew the intentions of these "underground" bodies. What is more, they were publicly discussed, along with the threat to the lives of other priests, perachers and Christian-Democratic Party leaders. The brutalities, killings and tortures, and the threats contained in extremist leaflets and posters pasted with impunity on the walls of buildings in the city and on army barracks were publicly denounced by the Bishop's office.

As usual, these acts of desperation boomeranged. The kidnapping heightened public indignation against the reactionaries and put the Church in a difficult position, for its dignity had been hurt by the insult to the prelate. The first visible repercussions saw several top officers, including Arriaga Bosque, Minister of Defense, and Arana Osorio, the bloodstained chief of the Zacapa military zone, dismissed from office. But it is too early to say whether the dismissals are anything more than a reshuffle of the uniformed "gorillas" in the army, which wields the actual power in the country today.

TERROR IS A POLITICAL WEAPON

The reactionaries are casting off all restraint. During the past eighteen months terror has been their main political weapon in the endeavor to neutralize the masses and contain the longing for freedom. Never before in our country—and, for that matter, hardly in any other Latin American country—has counter-revolutionary terror been so intensive.

People who inflict torture and then brag about it in public, giving minute details, can be described as maniacs. What they are doing, however, is dispelling all doubts as to their criminal aims and their determination to retain their grip on power. Their purpose is to crush the people, to cow them into submission and put an end to all democratic action.

In January the world was shocked to learn of the death of Rogelia Cruz, winner

of the national beauty contest, arrested by the police previously for revolutionary activities. She was found dead, with marks of cruel torture on her body.

In February, the police announced that four men who offered armed resistance to a night search in a house, had been killed in the ensuing exchange of fire. Strangely, none of the policemen sustained the slightest injury. Two of the murdered men were members of the Central Committee of the Guatemalan Party of Labor and leaders of the rebel armed forces—Rafael Tischler Guzman, former General Secretary of the Educational Workers' Union, and Cayetano Barreno, the others were young members of the rebel armed forces.

The facts of the case were not what the police announced. The men were apprehended singly under different circumstances four days before the alleged exchange of fire, and all four died under torture. Their corpses were then placed in a room where the police faked traces of a "shooting affray." The press were not allowed to see the room and could neither confirm nor deny the police version. Guzman's face was badly burned, his feet had been pierced by nails and his arms broken. Barreno had burns on the chest, his fingers were broken and his tongue and teeth were missing.

The reactionaries and the U.S. imperialists are shifting the responsibility for their counter-revolutionary terror to the so-called underground extremist organizations, allegedly acting in self-defense against the armed revolutionary movement. For a time this lie was accepted even by Guatemalans. However, subsequent developments revealed that the "underground" gangs were military men in civilian clothes and special police units.

The plurality of terrorist organizations—the Authentic National Organized Movement, the New Anti-Communist Organization, the Anti-Communist Council of Guatemala, the Anti-Communist Association and the Secret Army Organization—indicates that groups of officers are at each other's throats, each group eager to outdo the other in cruelty and gain an edge in the fight for power.

Most of those assassinated or killed in action were members of the Guatemalan Party of Labor, carrying out Party assignments in various fields, including the rebel forces. Some were rank-and-file members and some were leaders, including nine members, or half, of the Central Committee. Among the casualties were comrades

Victor Manuel Gutierrez, Leonardo Castillo Flores, Tranquilino Lopez, Libo Haroldo Gonzales, Rafael Tischler, Cayetano Barreno and Francisco Hernandez. Heading the list of those killed in action are Leonardo Castilla Johnson and Gustavo Grajeda.

THE MONTENEGRO GOVERNMENT: ACCOMPLICE OR CRIMINAL?

One might get the impression that the responsibility for the counter-revolutionary terror devolves solely on the officer groups and Right extremists, with the government powerless to control the situation.

This may have been more or less true in the early period of Mendez Montenegro's administration. Today, those who believe this are playing into the hands of the imperialists, who go out of their way to portray the government as "democratic" or "centrist," balancing between extreme Right and Left.

The secret police chief is a leader of the Revolutionary Party and a wealthy landowner. When his agents apprehend a revolutionary or anyone known to oppose the government, he is turned over to the military.

President Montenegro, far from being a "captive" of the gorillas, is in complete agreement with the counter-revolutionary terror and, what is more, is inclined to brag about its "success." In his New Year's message, he expressed satisfaction over the east of the country having been "pacified." What this stands for is gutted villages, burning towns and corpses floating down the Motagua River.

He is strong enough to curb the atrocities whenever public pressure mounts. San Carlos University, for example, demanded that Victor Manuel Valverde, a university professor held under arrest for 11 days and questioned, be shown to the public, which saved his life. But workers, peasants and students, ordinary people fighting for freedom and democracy, have no such protection. Thousands "vanish," and, as the Vice-President said in a speech, "their mangled bodies, bearing the marks of torture, are consumed by dogs and birds of prey."

Even if it were true that the government cannot control the situation, its culpability is obvious, because it condones the crimes, and history passes harsh judgment on criminals and accomplices alike, on the actual perpetrators of the crimes and equally on those who cover them up by their presence in the government.

HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR

Twenty years ago, when the world had been shaken by exposures of the monstrous crimes of Hitler's fascists the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and 1968 was proclaimed Human Rights Year.

It was a time when people thought crimes against humanity would never recur. Yet today the wave of counter-revolutionary terror in Guatemala matches the Hitler brutalities in many respects.

No other government in Latin America is more criminal than that of Guatemala. Yet Emilio Arenales Catalan, the Foreign Minister, is likely to be chosen chairman of the next U.N. General Assembly this year, which is Human Rights Year.

Catalan's election is made probable by the existing understanding among various *groups of countries* concerning the alternation of chairmen at the successive General Assemblies, it being the turn of the Latin American countries this year to nominate one of their foreign ministers, with all governments concerned supporting the nomination of the Guatemalan. This should surprise no one, because the U.S. imperialists are eager to maintain the illusions prevailing about the Montenegro government.

One wonders how such contempt of the United Nations is possible at a time when that body is about to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights. Surely the U.N. and the governments of various countries, that of Guatemala in particular, will be inundated with protests, for as the peoples recall the Hitler crimes, their conscience is bound to rebel at the prospect of counterrevolutionary terror being internationally condoned by the election as chairman of the U.N. General Assembly of the foreign minister of a government which flaunts the said Declaration more than any other in Latin America.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE GROWTH OF REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

Revolutionary violence erupted because the reactionaries blocked all the avenues for effecting democratic reconstruction by peaceful constitutional means. Every political act contrary to the anti-democratic and anti-national policy of the puppet government and army is stamped upon. The liberal democratic parties of the small bourgeoisie have been dissolved, Christian-

Democrats are subjected to "legal" harassment, while progressive trade union leaders are threatened, arrested and assassinated in the hope that this will put an end to the independent labor movement. Student leaders, democratic politicians and non-Communist revolutionaries are persecuted, abducted and tortured to death. The democratic opposition faces the choice of being silent and agreeing to the sale of the country to U.S. imperialism, seeing Guatemala turned into a U.S. colony, or braving peril in fighting for national and patriotic demands.

The past six years in which the situation stemming from the counterrevolution and the imperialist intervention of 1954 was consolidated, show that armed revolutionary struggle is justified. We can but regret that at a time when the unity of democratic and revolutionary forces is most essential, when these forces should stand together to repel the terror and the reactionary offensive, a group of comrades headed by Camilo Sanchez and Cesar Montes has seen fit to split the rebel armed forces and hurl abuse at the leaders of the Guatemalan Party of Labor, which handles the main tasks of the revolutionary struggle.

ONCE MORE ABOUT SOLIDARITY

The revolutionaries and the people of Guatemala, in the toils of struggle, are confronted by a brutal enemy politically and materially supported by the U.S. government, which supplies him with instructors, trains his political cadres in Puerto Rico and furnishes his organs of repression with arms, vehicles and dollars through the security service of the Inter-American Development Agency.

The people of Guatemala have always seen evidence of worldwide solidarity for their cause. Today, such solidarity is doubly significant. To expose the Mendez Montenegro regime working hand in glove with the military and with U.S. imperialism, should be the main motive of solidarity with the Guatemalans, with the revolutionary forces. If the attempt to elect foreign minister Emilio Arenales Catalan to the General Assembly chair in this year of Human Rights is frustrated and the deception of public opinion prevented, a big step forward will have been made in exposing the aims of reaction and imperialism in Guatemala.

Hernan BARRERA
Guatemala, March 31, 1968.

Israel: reaction on the rampage

(A letter from Tel-Aviv)

With the opening of hostilities on June 5, 1967, many political arrests were made in Israel. By means of administrative warrants based on the 1945 British Emergency Regulations many people were arrested including members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, town councillors in Nazareth, Acre and other places, members of the staff of the Communist newspaper *Al-Ittihad*, lawyers and others.

Notwithstanding their colonial character, the old-time British Emergency Regulations are still in force. On the strength of these Regulations military rule was established in all areas inhabited by Arabs in Israel to suppress freedom and as a means of seizing Arab land and making life unbearable for the Arab population. In many villages the inhabitants were forcibly evicted.

This rule, the official form of national oppression in Israel, was eased in recent years as a result of the sustained struggle headed by the Communist Party and the international campaign of solidarity. It was reimposed with the outbreak of hostilities in June, and once more police terror reigned in Arab villages and Arab citizens were hunted down. The aim was to create an atmosphere of fear with a view to isolating the Communist Party.

The Communist Deputy Tewfiq Toubi denounced these actions in the Knesset. In some villages, he said, people were arbitrarily arrested and taken to police-stations, where they were locked in special cells. Some of them, after brutal manhandling, were thrown out into the street unconscious and with broken limbs. The support of the Arab population in Israel for the Communist Party is a big obstacle to the official designs to deprive the Arab people of Palestine of their legitimate rights, to turn one people of one nation against the other.

Together with police measures victimization was practised in factories and workshops.

People were shocked by the wave of chauvinism, manifested in the rise of a movement for a "greater Israel," with all its "historical" borders, that include all Palestine and other Arab territories. Some 250 intellectuals, professors, writers and journalists, who support the aggressive policy of the Eshkol government, issued a statement denouncing the slogan of annexations, inspired by militarists like Defense Minister General M. Dayan and Labor Minister General Y. Alon.

They warned against the psychological consequences of this slogan of the Israeli youth, and on international public opinion. The voice of the Communist Party, the only party that opposed the war and now fighting for withdrawal from the occupied territories, moved other circles to action. A committee for peace and for the evacuation of the occupied territories has been formed. Nearly one hundred personalities, writers, poets, journalists, trade unionists, industrialists and artists signed an appeal to this effect, and denounced the policy of force and reprisals.

With the growing crisis of the continued occupation, the ruling circles are, in addition to reprisals and escalation, stepping up the onslaught against the last vestiges of democracy in the State.

Warrants restricting freedom of movement and travel have been issued by the military authorities against many well-known figures in public life, among them leading members of the Communist Party and other activists, leaders and members of the Communist Youth League, journalists, trade union leaders and thousands of citizens, some of whom are under daily police surveillance.

Those who have received these warrants

are prohibited from leaving their home towns for a period of one year until further notice. The reason: "to ensure public security and defense of the State."

The coercion is accompanied by a hysterical propaganda campaign in the press, radio, and official statements against communism and against the Arab countries.

Reactionaries howled for outlawing the Communist Party, for depriving Communist Knesset members of their parliamentary immunity.

The fight of the Communist Party against the terror did not pass unheeded. People began to realize that the war had not brought peace any nearer.

Fulfilling the wish of their transatlantic masters the Israeli rulers are transforming the country into a cockpit of cold war against the Soviet Union and the socialist countries and the national-liberation movement in the Middle East.

This was the background to the criminal attempt on October 15, 1967, against Meir Vilner, member of Knesset and leader of the Communist Party.

Vilner's assailant, an employee of a right-wing newspaper, received the mild sentence of eighteen month's imprisonment. Not without cynicism the judge remarked after passing the verdict, that the mildness of the sentence should not be understood as encouragement to similar acts!

The deteriorating situation in the Middle East proves that the war and the occupation have not advanced peace and security for Israel. By its struggle to eliminate the consequences of aggression, for a just solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict, the Communist Party is upholding the genuinely national interests of the Israeli people.

A meeting of the Central Committee of the Party held in February stated: "The danger of another military adventure exists . . . Uneasy about the growing awareness among public circles in Israel, the rulers have launched out on a drive against the true partisans of peace . . . Oppression in the occupied territories is multiplied. The danger that the system of democratic elections to the Knesset will be changed is increasing.

"The Central Committee calls on all democratic and peace-loving forces to unite to prevent further bloodshed, for a political solution by peaceful means of the crisis envisaging immediate withdrawal from the occupied territories, cessation of the state of war and recognition of the right of every state in the region to exist and live in security." The decision underlined that "by such steps, conditions for progress towards permanent peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors will be created."

H.S.

Against repressions in Tunisia

A violent campaign is under way in Tunisia against the country's progressive forces. Thirty-four people, among them public figures, students and intellectuals are due to be tried in Tunis. Most of them were subjected to torture during police interrogation, according to information received. The arrested include Abdel hamid Ben Mustafa, member of the Political Bureau of the Tunisian Communist Party and a member of the Vietnam Solidarity Committee.

The repressions were unleashed following the demonstration held on March 15 by the students in support of their colleague, Ben Jennet, savagely sentenced to

twenty years' hard labor. Jennet's "crime" was that he had participated in the anti-American and anti-imperialist demonstration in Tunis on June 5 last year, the day the Israeli aggression started against the Arab countries. In protest against the government's reprisals the Tunis University students held a three-day strike. They were joined in militant solidarity by the National Agricultural School.

The scope of the student demonstrations, the solidarity displayed in the recent strike speak of the student's determination to demand an end to the reprisals.

The authorities who reckoned that the savage sentence passed on Jennet would

intimidate the students now realize that they miscalculated, that repressions cannot resolve any of the crucial issues facing the country.

The student actions have once again made it clear that the independence of public organizations, such as the students' Union, must be respected, that the people must be allowed democratically to elect their representative bodies.

These events have likewise shown the bankruptcy of the one-party system with its suppression of public organizations and democratic rights, its prohibition of the Communist Party and the Left press. Communist and progressive students generally are being joined by the entire student body who are more and more dissociating themselves from the ruling party, and who express views which are very much at variance with those held by the authorities.

Students belonging to the Destour Party, too, are coming to share the standpoint of their fellow students on many issues, and are rejecting the position of their party. Whether it is the question of Vietnam or the suppression of democracy, violation of

university rights or police violence—the students are firmly taking issue with the official policy.

The facts clearly point to the imperative need for democratization in all spheres of life, for conditions allowing for free discussion, exchange of views, for a constructive dialogue in a democratic spirit, which the government refuses to do.

The student movement must be afforded the conditions to elect their leaders and hold free discussion. The students must be able to express their views without police interference.

Ben Mustafa and other arrested representatives of the intelligentsia and the students must be freed, the persecution and the police violence must be stopped.

These are the demands of the country's progressive forces, including people in the Destour Party who do not want their country to be notorious for its repressions and pro-American policy, who want to promote and enhance the positive gains of the Tunisian Republic.

KHALED



Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication

K. Marks i F. Engels i revoliutsionnaya Rossiya (Marx and Engels and Revolutionary Russia). Moscow, Politizdat, 1967. 810 pp.

MARX, K. *Englischer Alltag* (The English Scene). Compiled and prefaced by Richard Sperl. Authorized by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 280 pp.

MARX, K., ENGELS, F. *Werke—Ergänzungsband* (Works—Supplementary Volume). Articles, manuscripts, letters written before 1844. Part II. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1967. 593 pp.

Marx-Engels Verzeichnis (Marx-Engels Index). Compiled and prepared for print by Manfred Kliem, Horst Merbach and Richard Sperl. Second enlarged edition. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 400 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Sochineniya* (Collected Works). Vol. 44. October 1917 - November 1920. Fourth edition. Moscow, Politizdat, 1967. 533 pp.

GALLEN, M. *I partigiani sovietici nella Resistenza italiana* (Soviet Partisans in the Italian Resistance). Roma, Editori Riuniti, 1968. 254 pp.

"Das Kapital" von Karl Marx und seine internationale Wirkung (Marx's Capital and Its International Impact). Speeches by foreign participants at the scientific session devoted to the centenary of Capital held under the auspices of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany between September 12 and 13, 1967. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 500 pp.

DLUBEK, R., SKAMBRAKS, H. "Das Kapital" von Karl Marx in der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung (1867 bis 1878) (Marx's Capital and the German Working-Class Movement (1867-1878)). Review and evidence of the influence of Capital. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1967. 406 pp.

DORNEMANN, L. *Jenny Marx: Der Lebensweg einer Sozialistin* (Dornemann, L., Jenny Marx: The Life of a Socialist). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 332 pp.

Determinism si cunoastere. Materialismul dialectic si stiintele moderne (Determinism and Cognition. Dialectical Materialism and Modern Science). Written by a group of authors. Bucuresti, Editura politica, 1967. 328 pp.

ELLENSTEIN, J. *La Révolution des révolutions* (The Revolution of Revolutions). Paris, Editions sociales, 1967. 188 pp.

IVANOV, N. N., MATKOVSKY, N. V. *Velikiye osnovopolozhniki marksizma* (The Great Founders of Marxism). Based on materials of the Marx and Engels Museum. Second enlarged edition. Moscow, Politizdat, 1967. 200 pp.

KLEER, J., ZAWADSKI, J., GORSKI, J. *Socjalizm—kapitalizm* (Socialism—Capitalism). Topical Economic Problems. Warszawa, KiW, 1967. 127 pp.

JAHN, W. *Die Marxsche Wert- und Mehrwertlehre im Zerrspiegel bürgerlicher Ökonomen* (Marx's Theory of Value and Surplus Value Through the Prism of Bourgeois Economists). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 400 pp.



Editions of the journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM"



EDITIONS IN ENGLISH
(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1, England

Progress Books,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada

FRENCH EDITIONS
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société d'Édition et
d'Information 9, Boulevard des Italiens
Paris (2e) France

Librairie Du Monde Entier,
5, Place St-Jean,
Bruxelles

Librairie Rousseau,
36, rue J.-J. Rousseau,
Geneve

RUSSIAN EDITION
Stredisko pro rozšírování tisku,
Praha 6, Thakurova 3
Czechoslovakia

BRAZILIAN EDITION
(in Portuguese)
Rua da Assembléia, 34
3.º andar, sala 304,
Rio de Janeiro, Estado da Guanabara
Brazil

BULGARIAN EDITION
Raznoiznos,
1, Rue Tzar Assen
Sofia

CEYLON EDITION
(In Sinhalese)
91 Cotta Road
Colombo, Ceylon

CYPRUS EDITION
(in Greek)
Laikon Praktorion,
Tricoupi Street, 53 T. Nicosia

CZECH EDITION
Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30

DUTCH EDITION:
Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22",
Amsterdam W

GERMAN EDITIONS
Deutscher Buch-Export und Import
GmbH,
Leipzig C 1, Leninstrasse 16

"Globus" Vertrieb ausländischer
Zeitschriften, Wien XX,
Höchstädtplatz 3,
Austria

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb
Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldstrasse 46,
Switzerland

HUNGARIAN EDITION
Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Arpad-U6

ITALIAN EDITION
Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 2, Roma

JAPANESE EDITION
Nauka Ltd.,
2, Kanda-Zinbocho
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

MONGOLIAN EDITION
Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul. Lenina 41, Ulan-Bator

POLISH EDITION:
P. K. W. Z. "RUCH", Warszawa,
Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION
Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G.
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa
Praha 6, Thakurova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia

Ediciones Pueblos Unidos,
Casilla Correo 589, Montevideo,
Uruguay

Fondo de Cultura Popular
Apdo. postal 2352
Mexico 1, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral
San Francisco 36,
Casilla 13201
Santiago, Chile

Editorial "Anteo,"
Entre Rios 1033,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina

SWEDISH EDITION
Arbetarkultur, Kungsgt 84,
Stockholm K, Sweden

VIETNAMESE EDITION
So'o xuất nhập khẩu sách bao 32,
Hai Ba tru'ng, Hà-noi

